

THE ECLECTIC REVIEW,

FOR FEBRUARY, 1831.

Art. I. *The Life and Correspondence of the late Admiral Lord Rodney.* By Major-General Mundy. 2 Vol. 8vo. pp. 947. Portrait. Price 1*l.* 4*s.* London, 1830.

WHO was it that originated, as a practical system of sea-fighting, the decisive manœuvre of breaking the line of battle? This long-agitated question has been recently revived by Sir Howard Douglas, as a claimant in behalf of his father; and we have gone through with much interest, though without entire certainty of result, the controversy to which his claim has given rise. There is, we believe, some difference of opinion among professional men, both as to the uniform expediency of the manœuvre, and concerning the historical question of its exclusive use in modern, at least in our own times. For all purposes of immediate inquiry, it may, however, be taken for granted, that, in naval conflict, the line of battle was first broken by Sir George Rodney's own ship, the *Formidable*, on the 12th of April, 1782.

In a work published some short time since, it was stated by Sir H. Douglas, that his father, Sir Charles, who was Rodney's first captain in that engagement, urged repeatedly and ineffectually on the Admiral, and at last wrung from him by importunity a reluctant consent, to carry the flag-ship through an opening in the French line. This statement was supported, in all its circumstances, by the disinterested testimony of two officers, still living, who were then on the quarter-deck of the *Formidable*, and witnessed the whole transaction. The *Quarterly Review* chose to quarrel with these allegations; with Sir H. Douglas for making them, and with the witnesses for supporting them. The article, which General Mundy seems to think as decisive an affair as any breaking of the line can possibly be, appeared to us, when we read it, though authoritative

in its tone, to halt miserably in its reasoning. There was much and exceedingly supercilious browbeating of the evidence; there was a mighty fuss about considering the fame of great men as 'public property'; there were queries and innuendoes; there was, in brief, a multitude of words, but neither proof nor disproof. In answer, and, so far as we can judge, in unanswerable answer to all this, Sir Howard Douglas returned to the charge with a mass of documentary testimony and incidental illustration, before which the Quarterly has, hitherto, been mute. The volumes under review, throw no light whatever on the question. General Mundy shelters himself behind the Reviewer; puts conspicuously forward the very questionable reminiscences of Richard Cumberland; and lays great stress upon a very guarded statement by Sir Gilbert Blane, which avoids grappling with the gist of the business, and closes with an expressive intimation, that it was *highly fortunate* for Lord Rodney to 'have had about him an officer so gallant, intelligent, 'and energetic' as Sir Charles Douglas.

But there is another and exceedingly interesting question, which requires definitive settlement, before the credit of this manœuvre can be assigned either to the Admiral or to the Captain of the fleet. Was either of them aware that it had been laid down systematically by an able, but navally inexperienced landsman? General Mundy makes very short work with this knotty point, contenting himself with the dry observation, that Mr. Clerk's, of Elgin (Eldin), claim to have suggested the movement to Sir George, has been 'completely negatived and for ever set at rest'. We must, however, confess that, after having read the strong reasoning on the contrary side, given in the late Number of the Edinburgh Review, we require something more tangible than vague negation or convenient evasion. We have not the means of bringing the matter to a settlement, and are unwilling to multiply words on a question of fact; but it seems to us, that the letter of the Count de Guichen, on which General Mundy relies as a positive proof of prior intention on the part of Lord Rodney, though it by no means invalidates the statement of Sir Howard Douglas, does, in conjunction with the circumstances of the battle with De Grasse, give some support to the opinion which ascribes to the Admiral previous knowledge, not resulting from his own investigation and invention, but obtained from communication with others. Self-suggestion is usually bold in enterprise; but, in realizing the plans of others, many of the motives to decided conduct are absent; and, neither in the indecisive action with De Guichen, nor in the victorious contest with De Grasse, can we trace the firm grasp of a well-digested system, or the thorough-going execution of a predetermined plan. Be all this as it may, Rodney's

fame rests upon a foundation that cannot be affected by any result of these controversies. He was a fearless man, a consummate commander; and the correspondence which is here, for the first time, laid before the public, exhibits his character to an advantage which is in no way aided by the very imperfect labours of the Editor. Yet, there could hardly have been found a subject that more demanded faithful dealing and intelligent elucidation. There are circumstances in Rodney's life that require much explanation; and it behoved his Biographer to clear up difficulties, to refute censure, and to give a fair exposition of the circumstances which gave plausibility to accusation. Very little of this has been done; and, while we express gratitude for what is given, we cannot but record our regret, that so much has been left for future biographers to supply, though with inferior means and increasing disadvantages.

'It hath been,' says an ancestor of the Admiral, 'a constant tradition in our family, that we came into this land with Maud, the Empresse, from foraign parts; and that for service done by Walter Rodeney, in her wars against King Stephen, the Usurper, she gave them lands and estates in this kingdom.' The manuscript which thus records the primal honours of the Rodeneys, is a curious document, written by the last of the family in the male line, and preserving many interesting particulars of its history, in the quaint, but expressive language of the time. We are half tempted to cite the passage in which the bereaved parent bears testimony to the virtues of his lost son, the last heir of his house; but pithier matter lies before us, and we pass on. The line of Rodeney did not run out its course without supplying materials for at least secondary history. A daughter of the family was wife to Thomas Burdet, basely murdered by sentence of servile judges, in the reign of Edward the Fourth, for words spoken in anger 'concerning a white buck which the king killed in his parke.' Good Sir John Rodeney, as they 'called him,' obtained that honourable addition from his conduct when offered a reward for his skill in jousting; he asked and obtained 'an abatement of the king's silver,' in behalf of his tenantry. Sir Edward Rodeney, in 1611, aided Sir William Seymour in his elopement with the Lady Arabella Stuart. Previously to that date, a deep tragedy had darkened the family annals. We shall give the particulars as stated by Wilson, in his life of James the First.

'Frances, daughter of Thomas, Viscount Bendon, who was the greatest both for birth and beauty in her time, married one Prannel, a vintner's son; and he dying soon after, she became a widow; upon whom Sir George Rodney, a gentleman in the west (suitable to her person and fortune) fixing his love, had good hopes from her to reap the fruits of it; but Edward, Earl of Hertford, being entangled with

her fair eyes, and she having a *tang* of her grandfather's ambition, left Rodney, and married the earl.

'Rodney, having drank in too much affection, and not being able with his reason to digest it, summoned up his scattered spirits to a most desperate attempt, and coming to Amesbury, where the earl and his lady were then resident, to act it, he retired to an inn in the town, shut himself up in a chamber, and wrote a large paper of well-composed verses to the countess in his own blood (strange kind of composedness), wherein he bewails and laments his own unhappiness; and when he had sent them to her, as a sad catastrophe to all his miseries, he ran himself upon his sword, and so ended that life which he thought death to enjoy, leaving the countess "to a strict remembrance of her inconstancy, and himself a desperate and sad spectacle of frailty."'

The Sir Edward Rodeney who aided in the escape of Arabella Stuart, and who afterwards compiled the memoir which has supplied us with these scraps of family history, married, in 1614, 'a lady of Queen Anna's privie chamber.' The wedding was superb: the 'marriage feast' was at the Queen's charges; and King James, who loved such merry-makings to his heart, knighted the bridegroom after the fashion of Sir Richard Monypies, in the *Fortunes of Nigel*. 'The presents in plate given 'unto my wife,' quoth the highly honoured Sir Edward, 'that 'day by great lords and ladies, and others her friends and 'kindred, did amount in value near 2000 pounds; but my 'charge in apparel, wedding-gloves, scarfes, and rewards to 'those that brought the presents, *did fully equal it*.'

From a collateral branch of this ancient and respectable family, the subject of the present memoir was descended. His grandfather was a lieutenant-colonel of cavalry; and his father campaigned in the Spanish war as a cornet of horse, but, after brief service, quitted the army for a quiet and retired life at Walton-upon-Thames. George Brydges Rodney derived his baptismal names from his sponsors, King George the First, and the Duke of Chandos: he was born Feb. 19, 1718, and received his education at Harrow School. He went early to sea; became a lieutenant in 1739, captain in 1742; and when in command of a forty-gun ship, took a vessel of equal force. In June 1747, he was with the squadron that intercepted the French St. Domingo convoy; and in October of the same year, he shared in Admiral Hawke's victory off Cape Finisterre. From 1748 to 1752, he was governor and commander-in-chief on the Newfoundland station; and in the latter year, having returned home, he took his seat in parliament for the borough of Saltash. In February 1753, he married Lady Jane Compton, who died four years after. He sailed with Hawke, when the latter engaged in the fruitless bombarding expedition to Rochefort; and he assisted, under Boscawen, at the taking of Louisburg. In

May 1759, he was promoted to the rank of rear-admiral, and took the command of a small squadron equipped for the bombardment of Havre, where an expedition was in preparation, supposed to be destined against the British territory. He did his work skilfully and with success: the hostile armaments were crippled, and their intended enterprise was adjourned *sine die*.

In 1761, Rodney was appointed commander-in-chief on the Leeward Island station, and, in conjunction with General Moncton, took Martinique. It was a remarkable feature in the Admiral's character, that he systematically set at nought that dry and rigid construction of orders, by which too many officers are apt to make excuses for their own timidity or indolence; and on the present occasion, he gave a striking illustration of his determination to act on his own conviction of sound policy and discretion, rather than on convenient suggestions of punctilio. Having received authentic intelligence that the enemy had designs on Jamaica, and that a squadron was on its way to the West Indies for the purpose of aiding in that enterprise, he immediately, although Jamaica was not within the limits of his command, took measures for the safety of that valuable island, despatching a strong division to its assistance. He was unable, however, to inspire General Moncton with similar feelings; and he rather dryly observes, that having 'again solicited the General for a body of troops' lying unemployed at Martinique, 'he must do him the justice to say, that he seems much concerned at the present distress of Jamaica, but does not think himself sufficiently authorized to detach a body of troops without orders from England.' As for himself, Rodney quietly expresses his hope, that the Admiralty will not blame him for so construing his instructions, as to hold himself 'obliged to succour any of his Majesty's colonies that may be in danger;' and states his determination to sail for Jamaica 'without a moment's loss of time.' A letter from an officer serving in the expedition to Martinique, describes in so lively a manner the exertions of the sailors engaged on shore, as to make it worth citing.

'All the cannon and other warlike stores were landed as soon as possible, and dragged by the *Jacks* to any point thought proper. You may fancy you know the spirit of these fellows; but to see them in action exceeds any idea that can be formed of them. A hundred or two of them, with ropes and pulleys, will do more than all your dray-horses in London. Let but their tackle hold, and they will draw you a cannon or mortar on its proper carriage up to any height, though the weight be never so great. It is droll enough to see them tugging along, with a good twenty-four pounder at their heels: on they go, huzzaing and hallooing, sometimes up hill, sometimes down hill; now sticking fast in the brakes, presently floundering in the mud and mire;

swearing and as careless of every thing but the matter committed to their charge, as if death or danger had nothing to do with them. We had a thousand of these brave fellows sent to our assistance by the admiral ; and the service they did us, both on shore and on the water, is incredible.'

The treaty of Fontainebleau, in February 1763, recalled Rodney from his active service. In the following January, he was made a baronet, and in the course of the year, married a second time. He was appointed Governor of Greenwich Hospital, and in that office distinguished himself by attention to the comforts of the pensioners. 'There are very few young sailors,' was his reply to one who thought him too liberal in that way, 'that come to London without paying Greenwich Hospital a visit ; and it shall be the rule of my conduct, as far as my authority extends, to render the old men's lives so comfortable, that the younger (younker?) shall say, when he goes away, "Who would not be a sailor, to live as happy as a prince in his old age!"' In January 1771, he obtained the appointment of Commander-in-Chief on the Jamaica station : in 1774, he was superseded.

The four ensuing years were spent in depression, and chiefly in an exile which can hardly be called voluntary, since it seems to have been his only refuge from a gaol. His fortune had never been large, and a handsome person, with gentlemanly manners, had made him an acceptable associate in fashionable society. He was warm-hearted and profuse ; nor has he escaped the imputation, though it is discredited by his Biographer, of a disposition to gambling. 'Many were the fortunes,' it is significantly observed, 'that were wrecked at the Dutchess of Bedford's assemblies, where Sir George was a frequent guest.' When he accepted the appointment to the Jamaica station, he had been compelled to resign the governorship of Greenwich Hospital, and an attempt to procure the government of Jamaica had failed. His circumstances became hopelessly embarrassed, and he was under the necessity of seeking security from arrest, by taking up his residence at Paris. Early in 1778, finding that matters were pressing to a rupture with France, he wrote to the Admiralty, tendering his services. The answer was cold and discouraging, though Lord Sandwich had always made the greatest professions of friendship, and officers of much inferior pretensions to himself, were appointed to important commands. He now determined on making a vigorous effort to obtain assistance toward the discharge of his debts, that he might obtain an audience of the King, and represent personally the circumstances of his case. His friends failed him, and he was extricated from his embarrassments by the liberal, but reluctantly

accepted aid of a Frenchman, Marshal Biron. It was a chivalric business altogether, on the Marshal's side; for he well knew Sir George's abilities, and that he risked his own popularity by the probable consequences of the act.

‘Upon the arrival of the intelligence at Paris of Sir George's great and decisive victory over the French fleet, on the 12th of April, 1782, the population of that city were inflamed with the most violent rage and resentment against the Maréchal, vehemently reproaching him with having brought that calamity upon their nation, and even proceeding to threats of personal violence, at which the Maréchal, little moved, replied, ‘that he gloried in the man whose liberty he had effected, and in the victory which he had so nobly won.’

‘In some of the notices which have been heretofore published respecting Sir George's detention at Paris, it has been confidently stated, that pending this period, Maréchal Biron waited upon the Admiral, with an offer from the king of France, of a high command in his fleet, since he could not obtain employment in that of Great Britain; and that Sir George immediately replied, “Had, Sir, this proposal come from yourself, I should have resented it as one of the greatest insults you could have offered me. Since, however, it emanates from a quarter *which can do no wrong*, I shall only answer that, though my own country has forgotten me, she alone is entitled to, and shall have the best services I can afford her.” Of the veracity of the above anecdote, it is impossible at present to produce any positive proof. It is, however, generally credited in the noble Admiral's own family.’

By the liberal assistance of the banking-house of Drummonds, the pecuniary advance made by the Marshal was immediately discharged; but, although the King, in a personal audience, promised that he should be employed on the first opportunity, it was not until the close of the year 1779 that he hoisted his flag as commander of a fleet destined for the West Indies. This was a season of severe trial to the energies of the nation. Party spirit was at its height; its disastrous effects were strongly felt among the officers of the navy; and Keppel's ill-fought battle off Ushant exhibited a lamentable evidence of its prevalence. During the period of his constrained inactivity, Rodney employed himself in drawing up able memorials for the guidance of the Admiralty. At length, on the 29th of December, 1779, he sailed on that eventful command which was to confer immortality on his name. His letters to Lady Rodney, during the interval of preparation, shew the intentness with which he was bent upon his service, and the strenuous efforts that he made to forward the equipment of his fleet: they give, too, advantageous illustration of his family attachments.

‘Our dear girls' pictures are hung up in my cabin; I own it is a very great relief to me when I look at them; at the same time I abuse the painter most heartily. The dog shall never draw mine, he has

done so much injustice to them. Give my dearest love to them and the other little ones.'

Before Rodney had been ten days at sea, he had rich earnest of a prosperous cruise. On the 8th of January, 1780, he fell in with a Spanish convoy of between twenty and thirty sail, laden with provisions and naval stores; seven of them were vessels of war: the whole were captured. His next despatch was dated from Gibraltar Bay, and announced a signal victory, gained on the 16th and 17th, over the Spanish fleet under Don Juan de Langara. Besides those that were destroyed or crippled, 'five 'Spanish men-of-war, as fine ships as ever swam,' were taken. In his public letter, the Admiral deemed it politic to describe in terms of eulogy, the behaviour of his captains; but, in his letter to Lady Rodney, he told a different tale, spoke of his reluctance to 'have the world believe that there were officers slack in their 'duty,' and avowed his conviction, that 'without a thorough 'change in naval affairs, the discipline of our navy' would be 'lost.' His language concerning himself, was, as it behoved to be, lofty—'I can defy envy, malice, or even villany, to tax me with 'not having done my duty even to the utmost extent.' His personal conduct was, indeed, of the highest order. When closing with the enemy, in the dusk of the evening, and doubtful respecting the numbers and force of the Spanish fleet, he called the master of the Sandwich—'Master,' was his brief order, 'this ship is not to pay any attention to the merchantmen or 'small ships of war. Lay me alongside the biggest ship you can 'see, or the admiral, if there be one.' The Corporation of London voted him the freedom of the City in a gold box; and some wag, who recollected that the same compliment had been paid to Admiral Keppel, on his very questionable triumph over the French fleet, but that the material of the box was *heart-of-oak*, launched the following very tolerable *jeu d'esprit*.

- ' Each Admiral's defective part,
Satyric cits, you've told;
That cautious *Leeshore* wanted *heart*,
And gallant Rodney, *gold*.
- ' Your wisdom, London's Council, far
Our highest praise exceeds,
In giving each illustrious Tar
The very thing he needs.
- ' For Rodney brave, but low in cash,
You *golden* gifts bespoke;
To Keppel rich, but not so rash,
You gave a *heart-of-oak*.'

There is nothing that lets one so completely into the secret

of character, as the inspection of correspondence; not merely when, as in the case of Rodney and his family,—including his dog, Loup, whom he usually refers to with that pleasant kind-heartedness which indicates good humour and affectionate dispositions,—it is the simple overflow of the feelings; but even when it is tainted by selfishness, or stiffened by the full dress of official and diplomatic intercourse. We have, in this way, some rather curious illustrations of the personal qualities of the Earl of Sandwich, then First Lord of the Admiralty. Though there appears to have been something of early intimacy between him and Rodney, yet, when the latter needed his interest and patronage, the minister of the Marine was cold, distant, formal. When the neglected officer had forced himself upon observation, obtained the royal notice, and, in the lack of willing and efficient leaders, been appointed to command, then came urgencies, half-hints of want of energy, recommendations to favour, and all the little, irritating bye-play of small-minded authority. But when the gallant seaman had placed himself in the eye of the nation,—swept the Spanish convoys—defeated De Langara—relieved Gibraltar—and thus rescued his country from fears and depression; then did his Lordship of the Admiralty take up a different descant, and claim for himself the praise and honour of having called forth from obscurity the Blake and Nelson of his day.—‘*I have pitched upon a man who knows his duty*’—‘*I am eager in dealing out to all around me the praise due to your merit*’—‘*I have obtained you the thanks of both Houses of Parliament*’;—with much other flummery of the same sort, which Rodney seems to have received with all possible courtesy, and to have prized at its just value.

In the action with the Spanish fleet, we have already intimated that Sir George had reason to be much displeased with some of his captains: he was destined to experience still more vexatious effects from their waywardness or cowardice. In one short month after reaching Barbadoes, he brought to action a superior French fleet under the Count de Guichen; and it is on this occasion that he is supposed, by his Biographer, to have manœuvred with the deliberate purpose of breaking the French line. We much doubt this; but, however it may be, there can be no question that Sir George Rodney displayed admirable seamanship. He first gained the weather-gage; he next brought his line of battle in close formation against a section of the hostile fleet; but, when he signalled his ships to engage, he was grossly disobeyed, and the enemy escaped. It is remarkable that one of the very few officers who really distinguished themselves in this engagement, was Captain Molloy,—the same, we believe, who, under Lord Howe, committed the very fault which he was now conspicuous in avoiding. The two captains

most disgracefully deficient, had both risen from the lower classes; one of them had once been coxswain of an admiral's barge: he was subsequently broke.

'The Marquis de Bouillé, the French governor of Martinique, afterwards paid a visit to England, and became exceedingly intimate with Lord Rodney. This engagement having on one occasion become the topic of conversation, the Marquis said, that one of his officers was on board Count de Guichen's ship, and that the French admiral, appreciating the masterly manœuvre by which his opponent had contrived to force him into action, as well as the noble example he set in his own ship, betrayed, by his countenance and certain expressions, the anxiety he felt for the result of the conflict. This anxiety was in some manner shared by his military friend, who, however, upon observing that few of the British fleet were disposed to partake of the glory and danger of the attack, relieved the spirits of De Guichen by exclaiming, "Courage, General! the English desert their commander."'

Rodney now felt the necessity of decided measures: his own honour and the interests of his country had been basely compromised, and he was determined to be trifled with no longer. If he had not, like Nelson, the happy skill of winning hearts, he possessed, in perfection, the genius of command; and he at once assumed the lofty attitude which was imperiously called for by the critical circumstances in which he was placed. He announced to his officers, that he should, in the event of battle, hoist his flag on board a frigate, and that if his slightest signal were not instantly and implicitly obeyed, the neglect would be punished by immediate supersession. He hung on the track of the French fleet, and at length gained sight of De Guichen; but no consideration would induce that cautious commander to risk an action. 'For fourteen days and nights, the fleets were 'so near each other, that neither officers nor men could be said 'to have had sleep.' This stern schooling had its expected effect on Rodney's refractory subordinates.

'My eye on them', he writes, 'had more dread than the enemy's fire, and they knew it would be fatal. No regard was paid to rank—admirals as well as captains, if out of their station, were instantly reprimanded by signals, or messages sent by frigates: and, in spite of themselves, I taught them to be, what they never had been before—*officers*; and shewed them that an inferior fleet, properly conducted, was more than a match for one far superior; and that France, with all her boasting, must give up the sovereignty of the sea to Great Britain, when, with twenty-three sail of the line, opposed to only nineteen, she did not dare either to attack or stand a battle, but basely fled before them, and avoided by all possible means any rencounter; but notwithstanding all their endeavours to the contrary, my van twice had an opportunity of attacking their rear, as they passed upon different tacks. The treatment they met with made them so shy, that we never could get near them again; and their ships being all clean, and mine so very

foul, it was impossible to follow them with the least probability of overtaking them.'

It is not unimportant to observe, with reference to this passage, or rather to that previous portion of the letter which states Rodney's intention of hoisting his flag on board a frigate, in the event of a battle, that it does not by any means bear out the opinion of those who cite the authority of this great Commander in favour of such a practice. French admirals have occasionally adopted it; and it presents advantages of extensive and undisturbed observation, which have led some skilful officers of our own navy to recommend the system, though none of them have, we believe, actually ventured on thus keeping aloof from the casualties of close quarters. Sir George Rodney mentions the scheme, evidently and solely in its application to a peculiar situation of affairs: some of his captains were either timid or treacherous, and while himself engaged in the anxieties of actual conflict, with his ship involved in smoke, it would be impossible for him to exercise that jealous vigilance which their misconduct had rendered necessary. But when he found that a different spirit pervaded his officers, and that they were to be thoroughly trusted in the emergencies of battle, he laid aside his design; and we find him not only occupying his station in the line, but taking the lead in that bold and decisive movement which threw his antagonists into irrecoverable confusion.

In the same letter to Lady Rodney from which we have just quoted, he expresses much indignation against the ministry for neglecting to send him adequate reinforcements. 'What are they about?' he asks: 'are they determined to undo their country?' He describes his embarrassments, and avows his resolution to tell the entire truth in his 'public letters', and to 'let the blame lie where it ought.' He assumes the high ground which his great services had entitled him to take:— 'Thank God, I now fear no frowns of ministers, and hope never again to stand in need of their assistance. I know them well. All are alike, and no dependence is to be placed on their promises.' Yet, the same communication which is thus fraught with anxious and indignant feeling, beautifully displays the tenderness of his kind and affectionate heart.

'I will endeavour', he says, 'to write to my dear girls. Tell Jenny (his daughter) I am much obliged by her affectionate letter; and I wish, after mentioning her sisters and the family, she would not forget my poor dog. I have another sort of French favourite now—a French boy, who, during the battle with the French fleet on the 17th of April, leaped overboard from the *Couronne*, when we set her on fire, and swam on board us. Many others perished in the same attempt. Humanity makes us take notice of him, poor boy!'

The command of the West India fleet was, in the time of Sir George Rodney, a very different affair from the same service within our own recollections. In the war of the French Revolution, our naval superiority was so decided as to leave the commander in chief on that station little more to do, than to remain quietly in harbour, while the vessels under his orders were employed in dodging privateers, and in chasing the ships of war that, 'few and far between', visited that quarter from the enemy's ports. But, during the war of the American Revolution, circumstances were altogether dissimilar. The French and Spaniards maintained there a superior force, both naval and military, well officered and equipped, keeping up an active warfare, under all the advantages offered by a complicated navigation. The Marquis de Bouillé was a skilful and indefatigable general, and his projects were zealously seconded by the commanders of the marine forces. Thus situated, it required all the talent and energy of Rodney, with an armament almost always inferior, to preserve the balance; and, so far as we are able to judge, his skill and enterprise were equal to the crisis. His letters are admirable specimens of knowledge, forecast, and reasoning; and his actions were always in the spirit of his statements. Not a circumstance, however minute, seems to have escaped him: his light ships were constantly ranging the ocean, and every vulnerable point had its squadron of observation, so far as his means extended. In September 1780, the season for active operations in the West Indies having passed for the year, he sailed for the coast of America, much to the annoyance of Arbuthnot, the admiral on that station, who remonstrated rather fiercely. It is very evident that Rodney disapproved of the manner in which the war with America was managed, both by land and by sea: but this is not a subject for our present investigation, and we pass on, with the Admiral, to an enterprise, of which the conduct excited much animadversion. The Dutch, after a season of hesitation, at length joined the league distinguished as the 'Armed Neutrality'; a measure which drew down upon them prompt and severe visitation. The island of St. Eustatius had long been the centre of a traffic, nominally neutral, but, in reality, subserving the interest of the French Americans, to the exceeding disadvantage of the English. Of this wealthy spot, it was resolved to take possession; and Rodney, determined to make all sure, made a grand sweep of every thing that he could lay his hands on, as hostile property, or as tainted by contraband transactions. This of course came home to the 'business and bosom' of many an individual, and among them, of not a few who, though engaged in a traffic essentially illegal, had contrived to keep on the safe side of the law. There was much clamour and much litigation. Rodney's mo-

tives were fiercely attacked, but, so far as appears from his correspondence, unjustly. We shall not, however, revive a dispute of which the interest has ceased: it is more to the present purpose to state, that, eventually, Rodney was no gainer by the affair; and by this it should seem that he had, at least, acted with some precipitancy. It is but fair to state, that there were circumstances which threw some mystery over the management of the business at home. Papers of the utmost importance to Rodney's claims, and deposited by him for safe custody in the Secretary of State's office, were, by some unascertainable means, abstracted, and the general result is thus accounted for by his Biographer.

‘ Various political circumstances, especially the termination of the American war shortly afterwards, rendered it expedient that the affair of St. Eustatius should not be thoroughly investigated, and that the conduct of those in this country who had secretly assisted the revolted colonists should not be too strictly examined. This contributed at the time to leave the question involved in a degree of mystery which has never since been cleared up; although the general impression has ever been, that the conciliatory spirit which it was thus deemed politic to adopt towards those who during the war had assisted our enemies, was attended with great injustice towards the Admiral.’

Rodney invariably expressed himself in terms of strong and indignant feeling about St. Eustatius; and, in his letters to Lady Rodney, where his real sentiments are expressed without disguise, his language is equally energetic. ‘ This rock’, he says on one occasion, ‘ of only six miles in length and three in breadth, has done England more harm than all the arms of her most potent enemies, and alone supported the infamous American rebellion.’ When the Admiral, in 1781, was in England, he repelled with considerable animation, in the House of Commons, as member for Westminster, the imputations cast upon his character. He had, on that occasion, to stand the fierce fire of Burke's impassioned eloquence. His visit was a brief one: his health had suffered much, and he came home to recruit; but he was soon forced out again, by the increased activity of the Marquis de Bouillé and the Count de Grasse, against whom Sir Samuel Hood's inferior forces, notwithstanding the consummate skill and intrepidity of that excellent officer, would not allow him to make effectual head. We imagine that there has been no finer instance of decision and ability, than was displayed by him, when he decoyed De Grasse from his anchorage in Basseterre Roads, St. Christopher's, and placed his own fleet in the very position which the French admiral had quitted. The Count de Grasse had received intelligence of Hood's approach,

'and, confiding in his superiority of numbers, immediately put to sea. Sir Samuel Hood's object being to relieve the island, he instantly indicated by signal his intention of steering for the anchorage which the enemy had just quitted, which he adroitly accomplished in spite of all the exertions of the French admiral; who, too late, perceived the error he had committed, and who again attempted the ensuing morning to dislodge him from his station, but in vain. The island, however, having, in consequence of the enemy's great superiority of force, been compelled to capitulate, which it did on the 13th of February, nothing remained for the British admiral but to quit his station, now become very perilous and quite untenable, as soon as possible. He, therefore, gave orders for the ships to cut their cables at eleven o'clock, on the night of the 14th, and put to sea, proceeding under easy sail (the sternmost and leewardmost ships first, and so on in succession), till otherwise directed by signal. This manœuvre was effected with such perfect order and secrecy, that the enemy, who were only five miles distant, were not aware of it till the following morning, when the British squadron had vanished out of sight.'

Circumstances had now become urgent; and bidding seasons at defiance, Rodney put to sea. By carrying 'a press of sail', notwithstanding a 'very severe gale', he weathered Ushant, and 'through storms, and tempests, and contrary winds,' succeeded in forcing his way in five weeks to Barbadoes. 'None', he writes with the excusable elation of a British seaman, 'but 'an English squadron, could have forced its way to the West Indies as we have done. Poor ——'s fatal cape of Ushant, 'we weathered in a storm but two leagues, the sea mountains 'high, which made a fair breach over the Formidable and the 'Namur.' This was a brave beginning; but his mind was made up to all risks. He had promised a friend who wished him a prosperous voyage, that he would bring him back *a present of De Grasse*; and when some one told him that the French admiral had spoken of him in terms of ridicule, he avowed his determination that, if ever they came alongside each other, *one should be a prisoner*. Nothing, indeed, was now wanting to him, but such an opportunity. The Admiralty had given him a fleet, strong in numbers and gallant captains to the full extent of his wishes; and it was felt by both French and English, that a collision must take place. He found the West Indies almost in the enemy's power, and his first cares were directed to the security of Jamaica, against which the French were preparing, at Martinique, a powerful armament. Their first object, which it was, of course, Sir George's anxiety to defeat, was to form a junction with the Spanish fleet at Hispaniola. De Grasse endeavoured to gain his point, by creeping under the islands; but he was followed so hard by Rodney, that he was at length compelled to stand at bay. Having already

adverted to some of the more important circumstances connected with this great battle, we shall not renew the discussion here, but give, as the best general statement of particulars, the following extract from "*Select Dissertations on Subjects of Medical Science*,"—a highly interesting work, by Sir Gilbert Blane, Physician to the fleet, who was in personal communication with the Admiral during the engagement.

'About half an hour before the engagement commenced, at breakfast on board of the *Formidable*, the company consisting of the Admiral, Sir Charles Douglas, captain of the fleet (an officer whose functions nearly correspond to those of the adjutant-general of an army), Captain Simmons, commander of the ship, Lord Cranstoun, a volunteer post-captain, the Admiral's secretary, and myself,—the conversation naturally turned on the glorious prospect of the day; and Lord Cranstoun remarked, that if our fleet should maintain its present relative position, steering the same course close-hauled on the opposite tack to the enemy, we must necessarily pass through their line in running along, and closing with it in action. The Admiral visibly caught the idea, and no doubt decided in his own mind at that moment, to attempt a manœuvre at that time hitherto unpractised in naval tactics. It was accordingly practised by him with the most complete success, setting the illustrious example in the ship which bore his own flag; for the signal for close action being thrown out, and adhered to in letter and spirit for about an hour, and after taking and returning the fire of one half of the French force, under one general blaze and peal of thunder along both lines, the *Formidable* broke through that of the enemy. In the act of doing so, we passed within pistol-shot of the *Glorieux*, of seventy-four guns, which was so roughly handled, that, being shorn of all her masts, bowsprit, and ensign-staff, but with the white flag nailed to the stump of one of the masts, breathing defiance as it were in her last moments, became a motionless hulk, presenting a spectacle which struck our Admiral's fancy, as not unlike the remains of a fallen hero; for, being an indefatigable reader of Homer, he exclaimed, that now was to be the contest for the body of Patroclus. But the contest was already at an end; for the enemy's fleet, being separated, fell into confusion, a total rout ensued, and victory was no longer doubtful.' *Blane*, pp. 75, 6.

Sir George Rodney was blamed for not following up the enemy through the night; but a paper in his own hand-writing, found after his decease, assigns strong reasons for his caution in this respect. It was also asserted, that, if the advice of his first captain had been followed, the victory would have been more decisive; and the evasive language of Sir Charles Douglas, when the subject was referred to in his presence, seems to indicate that there was some reason for the imputation. 'We had a great deal to do, Sir; and I believe you will allow that we did a great deal.'

Previously to the arrival of the intelligence in England, a

new administration had succeeded the party which patronized Sir George; and Admiral Pigot had been sent out for the purpose of superseding him. When the news came, the ministers were anxious to rescind their order; but it was too late; the vessel had sailed, and nothing remained but to join in the popular applause, and to decree titles and pensions to the hero of his day. Rodney returned; and the following anecdote may assist in giving some notion of the enthusiasm which his presence excited.

‘ On Lord Rodney’s arrival at Bristol, he took up his quarters at the Bush Tavern, where himself and his suite were entertained in the most sumptuous style. The next day, on his Lordship inquiring for his bill, the patriotic landlord replied: “ Your Lordship forgets that you paid it beforehand on the 12th of April.” Two days afterwards, when the noble Admiral had got into his carriage to be driven to Bath, he begged to be conveyed thither as expeditiously as possible. The person who rode the leaders instantly turned round, and taking out his watch (when his Lordship instantly recognized Mr. Weeks in the dress of a postillion), “ as your Lordship said to the governor of St. Eustatius, on demanding his capitulation, in an hour, my Lord, and not a moment longer ”; and Mr. Weeks was as good as his word.’

In the year 1787, Lord Rodney made a tender of his services, and received an evasive acknowledgement from Mr. Pitt. When the Regency question was agitated, he joined with the Royal Dukes and other peers, in a protest against the imposition of restrictions on the Regent; and in consequence of this step, his son, Captain John Rodney, was refused a command which had been previously promised. The old Admiral resented this despicable procedure in a firm and dignified remonstrance to the Earl of Chatham, then at the head of the naval administration. During the latter years of his life, Lord Rodney had been much visited with gout; and his constitution, never very strong, gradually broke down under repeated attacks of that slow, but sure invader of the sources of existence. He died in the night of May 23, 1792, in his 71st year.

We shall not go again over ground which we have already travelled, but leave the character, personal and professional, of this great commander, to be inferred from the materials with which we have furnished our readers. We have been induced to give a more ample exhibition than we are usually wont to allow, in consideration of the elevated rank he holds in our naval history. He was a seaman of the highest order, exemplary as a disciplinarian; and he led the way to that close and decisive system of fighting which has made Great Britain the first naval power of the world.

Art. II. *The Errors of Romanism traced to their Origin in Human Nature.* By Richard Whately, D.D. Principal of St. Alban's Hall, &c. 8vo. pp. xxviii. 348. Price 10s. London. 1830.

WE have often been led to regard it as one of the most unhappy consequences resulting from the controversy between Conformists and Nonconformists in this country, that it has seemed to render it a point of honour with the Churchman, to shut his eyes to every defect in the system he is pledged to uphold;—as, in troublous times, men are obliged to barricade their windows, to keep out an enemy, and obtain security at the expense of living in the dark. The dread of giving an advantage to the Dissenters, of symbolizing with the Sectaries, or, worst of all, of being stigmatised as disaffected to the Church, has sealed the lips and fettered the spirit of the clergy, so as to preclude their instituting any inquiries that might have issued in the detection and removal of the faults and errors incident to every human system, whether of doctrine or of polity. It might seem to be in the highest degree Quixotic, for Dissenters to take upon themselves any part of the blame attaching to the stationary and passive character of the Establishment; more especially as they have not been backward in testifying against all that they deem erroneous or evil in the system. But, though they cannot be fairly blamed for this, acting, as they have ever done, on the defensive, they have been, we think, to a certain extent, the innocent cause of diverting the attention of the Church from all attempts at self-improvement. Parties within the Establishment, who could never have been otherwise made to coalesce, have been united by a jealousy of the enemy without; and the watch-word of 'The Church is in danger', has been sufficient to call every man to the battlements by a sense of common interest. The Dissenters have been viewed and represented simply as enemies and rebels, ever bent on the demolition of the Establishment, whose objections, proceeding from mere faction and unreasonable hostility, were unworthy of being listened to, and to whom no concessions should be made.

Accordingly, no concessions have been made,—none by the Church in her corporate capacity. During the one hundred and seventy years that have elapsed since the Restoration, it is a remarkable fact, that no attempt has been made to place the Church of England in correspondence with the increased intelligence, the more liberal spirit, or the altered circumstances of the times. While every thing else has been in progress, the Church, as an institution, in her canons, rubrics, ritual, and polity, still speaks the language, and maintains the prejudices of the seventeenth century. To the present day, the Church of England is governed by Charles II. and the Bishops of his

appointment. In fact, a very large proportion of the clergy may be said to live, in imagination, in those times. Their precedents, their habits of thinking, their politics, their theology, are all drawn from that period. Their historical recollections, with Southey's Book of the Church, stop short at the Revolution; and their greatest glory is that of being not wiser than their fathers.

There is not a much more trite or hackneyed axiom, than that which is conveyed in the admired phrase, *Fas est et ab hoste doceri*; but there is none which is less easily reduced to practice. Men will not submit to be so taught, but will hate and reject truth whenever it comes from those whom they dislike. Most persons, when told of their faults, are merely put upon defending them. Collective bodies are still less apt to confess themselves in the wrong, and to set about the unpalatable and self-denying work of reformation, on the prompting of a despised minority. To the objections against her forms or doctrines, reiterated by dissidents from without, through nearly two centuries, the Church has turned a deaf and haughty ear. The controversy stands, at the present moment, pretty nearly in the same state in which it was left on the breaking off of the Savoy Conference in 1661. And there, for all that Dissenters might say, it is likely to rest—till the Millennium.

Of late, however, things have assumed a very novel aspect, in consequence of the nascent spirit of free inquiry within the Establishment. We allude not now to the loud and general clamour for reform in the administration of the revenues and patronage of the Church, which is partly of a political character, and is instigated by the pressure of the times. The recent publications of Mr. Acaster, Mr. Nihill, Mr. Riland, Mr. Hurn, and others, are indications which cannot be mistaken, of approaching changes, the precise nature of which we will not venture to predict, but by which we entertain the cheerful confidence that the cause of Truth and Piety will be promoted. But no publication that has yet come before us, affords so striking an instance of this new-born spirit of candid inquiry in matters ecclesiastical, leading to the re-discovery of neglected truths, and of bold consistency in avowing the results of such investigation, as the present valuable work from the pen of Dr. Whately.

Had the Author of this work been a Protestant Dissenter, it might have been regarded as an invidious and sinister attempt to convict the Church of England of retaining, how unconsciously soever, many of the errors of that Church against which she protests. And the apology here put forward, that such errors as are common to the two Churches, have their origin in human nature, would, possibly, have been regarded as a masqued

battery. This, it would have been said, is the old story over again,—the stale objection of the Puritans, dressed up in a philosophical garb, the mere offspring of perversity and prejudice. But no imputations of this cast can be thrown upon Dr. Whately. So far from having adopted his views from Protestant Dissenters, he scarcely seems to be aware of their existence; he vouchsafes not to notice them. The fact, that the very Errors which he here exposes, are the errors to which Nonconformity is most chiefly and directly opposed,—that the truths which he has in so masterly a style illustrated and defended, have long been the prevailing and characteristic opinions of the great body of Protestants holding the Congregational Polity,—seems to be wholly unknown to him; and it is even possible that he may receive this intimation of it with incredulous surprise. That such is the fact, however, our readers will soon perceive.

The Errors which Dr. Whately has here selected for consideration, ‘as being among the most prominent, and usually regarded as most characteristic of the Romish Church,’ but which he endeavours to trace to our common nature, are thus recapitulated.

‘1. Superstition; considered as consisting, not in this or that particular mode of worship, but in *misdirected* religious veneration generally. 2. The tendency towards what may be called a vicarious service of God; a proneness to convert the Christian minister into a priest, and to substitute his sanctity of life and devotion for those of the people. 3. The toleration of what are called “pious frauds”, either in the sacrifice of truth to supposed expediency, or in the propagation of what is believed to be the truth, by dishonest artifice. 4. An undue deference to Human Authority; as, in other points, so especially in forgetting the legitimate use of creeds, catechisms, liturgies, and other such compositions set forth by any Church, and intruding them gradually into the place of Scripture, by habitually appealing to them (where the appeal ought always to be made to the records of Inspiration) in *proof* of any doctrine that is in question: which practice I have pointed out as not originally the consequence, but the cause, of the claim to inspiration and infallibility set up by the Church. Lastly, —Intolerance, or the spirit of Persecution; *i. e.* the disposition to enforce by secular coercion, not this or that system of religion, but one’s *own*, whatever it may be; a fault inherent in human nature, and to which consequently all mankind are liable, however strongly they may reprobate (as *e. g.* the Romish Church has always done) persecution, or any form of compulsion, exercised on themselves.”—pp. 319, 20.

It is no part of Dr. Whately’s design, as may well be supposed, to palliate these errors in the Romish Church, or to shew that they are less criminal, because they are the offspring, not of Romanism, but of corrupt human nature. His object is to

point out the danger of viewing them as existing only in that Church, and of neglecting to guard against the spirit of those corruptions, while exulting in the name of Protestants. Such a work must be regarded as peculiarly seasonable at the present crisis; and Dr. Whately deserves the warmest thanks of every sound Protestant, every enlightened Christian, for the admirable sagacity and fidelity with which he has analysed and exposed the spirit of Popery lurking under Protestant forms. Unless the principles which are here illustrated are kept constantly in view, the effect of having our thoughts turned by frequent discussion towards the errors of Romanism, will be, he remarks, to put us off our guard against 'similar faults in some different shapes; and the more shall we be apt to deem every danger of 'the kind effectually escaped, by simply keeping out of the pale 'of that corrupt Church.' It is a remarkable fact, which must have come under the observation of many of our readers, that the most violent Anti-catholics, as they are improperly designated, are generally found among that class of Protestants who approach the nearest, in their spirit and in many of their religious sentiments, to the objects of their invective. Theirs is, in fact, simply a political, or an ecclesiastical quarrel with a hostile Church: they hate its errors far less than they dread its claims.

The errors in question may not, perhaps, be regarded by some persons as the most prominent or fundamental characteristics of Romanism: at least, others, it may be thought, claimed equally to be noticed. Many persons, Dr. Whately remarks, 'would place foremost, one to which they give the title of self-righteousness.' We must transcribe his reasons for not devoting a separate head to this error, as they will require a little examination.

'The word (self-righteousness) does not perhaps savour of the purest English *; but what they mean is, a confident trust in the *merit* of our own good works, as sufficient to *earn* eternal happiness, and as entitling us to that as a just reward. The Romish Church, however, has not in reality ever set this forth as one of her distinct tenets. If

* According to the analogy of other similar compounds, Dr. Whately contends, such as 'self-love,' 'self-condemnation,' &c., self-righteousness should signify, upright dealing in respect of one's self. He must be aware, however, that the term righteousness is here used in the sense of justification, as in the authorized version of the New Testament; and that self-righteousness, i. e. self-justification, is designed to answer to the expressions, τὴν ἰδίαν δικαιοσύνην and ἑμὴν δικαιοσύνην. The ambiguity of the term righteousness has been a source of much misconception; but the fault lies with our Translators.

any one will consult, what is of decisive authority in that Church, the decrees of the Council of Trent, he will perceive, that though they may perhaps have made an injudicious use of the word "merit," the abstract question between them and others (not Antinomians) is chiefly verbal. For they admit, and solemnly declare, that nothing we can do can be acceptable before God except for the sake of Jesus Christ; and that we are unable to perform good works except by his Spirit working in us: so that what is called a Christian's righteousness, is at the same time the righteousness of Christ, although the Scriptures promise repeatedly and plainly, that it will, through his goodness, not "lose its reward."

'That part of their theory which is the most objectionable on this score, is the doctrine, that from the pains of *purgatory* Christ has not redeemed us, but we are to be rescued either by penances done in this life, or by masses offered in our behalf after our death.

'But I do think that, in practice, the Romish system tends to foster the error in question; not so much, however, by the use of the words *merit* and *reward*, as by the importance attached to the *actual performance* of a vast multitude of specific works, many of them arbitrarily prescribed: such as abstinence from particular meats on particular days, repetition of Ave-Marys and Pater-nosters, pilgrimages, crossings, &c., which have a manifest tendency to absorb the attention in the *act* itself—to draw off the mind from the endeavour after inward purity—and to create the feeling so congenial to our nature, that we have been so far advancing in the performance of something *intrinsically* capable of forwarding our salvation.' pp. 36, 37.

Dr. Whately proceeds to remark, that it would be a great mistake, 'to imagine that Protestants, even those who are the 'forwardest in condemning this particular kind of spiritual 'pride, called by them self-righteousness, are therefore exempt 'from the danger of spiritual pride altogether. One may sometimes,' he says, 'hear a man professing himself the chief of 'sinners—proclaiming his own righteousness to be filthy rags, '—calling himself a brand plucked out of the burning—resting 'his confidence of salvation wholly on the atonement of the Redeemer, and on the imputation to himself of the righteous 'works performed by Christ,—who, while renouncing boasting 'in words, is full of the most overweening confidence in his own 'gifts and graces.' All this may be very true, but it is extremely little to the purpose; and we do marvel that so acute and candid a writer as Dr. Whately should have confounded things so distinct as a vice of temper and an error of doctrine. Self-righteousness, in the sense intended, is not spiritual pride, which implies an overweening sense of our attainments, gifts, or infallibility. Self-righteousness may or may not be associated with this disposition; but it is in itself a palpable error, an integral and characteristic part of that system 'which may be called, in 'a certain sense, the *Religion of Nature*,' as being 'such a kind

'of religion as "the natural man" is disposed to frame for him-
'self.' (p. vii.) It implies the notion, that man is able to turn
away from himself, by his good works or his penal sufferings,
the condemnation which attaches to him as a sinner. It is true,
that many who hold this notion, pay Our Saviour the compli-
ment of admitting, that it is through him, and by virtue of the
concurrent efficacy of his atonement, that they are able to do
this. The efficacy of penances and pilgrimages, alms and
masses, ave-marias and pater-nosters, is *hypothetically* conse-
quent upon his interposition. But still, it rests with sinful man
to *entitle himself*, by his own doing or suffering, to the remission
of sin and the possession of heaven.

Dr. Whately seems to represent the Romish system of justi-
fication as erroneous, chiefly as it tends 'to create the feeling
'that we have been advancing in the performance of something
'*intrinsically* capable of forwarding our salvation.' But the
distinction between intrinsic and extrinsic or conditional, is, in
this reference, too nice and intangible to be of any practical im-
portance. Were such the only difference between truth and
error on this point, plain Christians would require to be meta-
physicians. Whatever performance of ours is capable of for-
warding our salvation, must be intrinsically capable of forward-
ing it; except, indeed, in the case of prescribed rites of a sym-
bolic character, such as those of the Jewish dispensation, the
acceptableness of which resulted immediately from the positive
appointment of God, and not from any inherent value.

We are as little disposed as Dr. Whately is, to insist upon
mere verbal distinctions: we profess ourselves latitudinarians in
phraseology, although not in creed. We have no quarrel with
the words merit, reward, good works, virtue,—grossly and per-
niciously as they are often misapplied; for, indeed, the Scrip-
tures plainly teach, that the good works of the Christian have
merit, and shall be rewarded, as surely as the industry of the
husbandman is recompensed with the harvest. And this prospect
of an infinite reward is urged by St. Paul as a motive not to be
weary in well doing. Liberality, benevolence, kindness, God
will recompense at the resurrection of the just. We recognize
the importance of unequivocally insisting upon these Scriptural
statements, for with such motives the languid zeal of Christians
requires to be constantly plied; and we never wish to be more
orthodox than the Scriptures. But 'the abstract question' be-
tween the Romanists and ourselves on this point, seems to
hinge upon a difference which Dr. Whately must admit to lie a
little deeper than the surface of phraseology. The question is,
whether the deeds of either sinner or saint can have, under any
circumstances whatever, a *propitiatory efficacy*;—whether, in-
trinsically or extrinsically, in connexion with faith or without it,

they have any power to forward our redemption by 'putting away our sins,' (as the xiith Article expresses it,) or by turning away the wrath of God, and reversing our just condemnation. The acceptableness of good works is not the question, nor how they become acceptable, nor when, nor under what conditions. Definitions and dogmas intended to settle these points, fall very far short of the mark. There seems to us no danger of attributing any degree of merit to good works which can be reasonably claimed for them, short of an expiatory or piacular virtue. For this purpose, they are, at the best, worthless, and worse than worthless. The very attempt to make them serve this purpose, converts them into sin; for, if our absolution from sin result from works, then 'Christ is dead in vain.'

The notion (unhappily not confined to the Romanists) that good works, though not in themselves of expiatory virtue, derive a satisfactory and piacular efficacy from the righteousness, or atonement, or intercession of Christ, betrays a lamentable confusion of ideas, and is practically subversive of the hope of the Gospel. Were this the doctrine of the Christian Revelation, it would differ little, after all, from the religion of human nature, and from the notions of the heathen on the subject of propitiation and mediation. 'Now every peculiarity of our religion,' Dr. Whately justly remarks, 'is worth noticing, with a view to the confirmation of our faith.'

'For, that our religion should differ from all others, in points in which they all agree, is a presumption, at least, that it is not drawn from the same origin. And the presumption is the stronger, inasmuch as the difference is not slight or verbal, but real or essential. The priesthood of pagan nations, and that of our own,' (improperly so called, as the Author has shewn,) 'are not merely unlike, but, in the most essential points, even opposite. They offer sacrifices for the people: *we* refer them to a sacrifice made by another. They profess to be the mediators through whom the Deity is to be addressed: *we* teach them to look to a heavenly Mediator, and in his name boldly to approach God's mercy-seat themselves. They study to conceal the mysteries of religion; *we* labour to make them known. The Romish Church has in fact, in a great degree, transformed the Presbyter (the priest of the Gospel dispensation) into the *Hiercus*, or Levitical Priest; thus derogating from the honour of the one Great High Priest, and altering some of the most characteristic features of his religion into something more like Judaism or Paganism than Christianity.

'The Romish Priest professes, like the Jewish, to offer sacrifice (the sacrifice of the mass) to propitiate God towards himself and his congregation. The efficacy of that sacrifice is made to depend on sincerity and rectitude of intention, not in the *communicants* themselves, but in the Priest: he, assuming the character of a mediator and intercessor, prays, not *with*, but *for* the people, in a tongue unknown to

them, and in an inaudible voice; the whole style and character of the service being evidently far different from what the Apostle must have intended, in commanding us to "pray for one another." The Romish Priest undertakes to reconcile transgressors with the Almighty, by prescribing penances, to be performed by them, in order to obtain *his* absolution; and profanely copying our only High Priest, pretends to transfer to them his own merits, or those of the saints.' pp. 109—112.

This is admirably put; and we entirely agree with the Author, that a large and important portion of the errors of the Romish Church may be comprehended under this general charge, that they have destroyed the true character of the Christian priesthood. We admit also, that this feature of the system may be traced to the innate propensity of mankind to endeavour 'to serve God by proxy'; that 'the disposition men 'have ever shewn to substitute the devotion of the Priest for 'their own', is 'not so much the consequence, as it is the origin 'of Priestcraft.* But whence arises this disposition or propensity in mankind? Dr. Whately justly accounts for it, in part, by remarking, that 'through the corruption of his nature, 'man's heart, except when divinely purified, is too much alienated from God to take delight in serving him.' But this leaves still unaccounted for, the general anxiety 'to serve him 'by proxy.' Dr. W. seems to resolve this into 'a natural reverence for religion, and a desire that God should be worshipped.' But the question again returns, Whence this desire in those who take no delight in serving him? The answer is, that a sense or dread of the Divine anger, is the true source of that anxiety to honour and appease a Being who is not known and not loved, which is the foundation, or rather the essence of all superstition. Hence, all religions of man's devising have had but one aim and purpose in reference to the Object of Worship, namely, to propitiate the Deity.

Now if this be any part of the design of Christian worship or Christian obedience, our religion differs little, after all, from the religion of human nature. In the most essential circumstance, it does not differ from other religions; and the presumption that it is not drawn from the same origin, is materially weakened, if not destroyed. Admitting that Christianity knows nothing of a mediatorial priesthood, if it teaches men to offer a propitiatory service for themselves, it differs from false religions, only as to the means and apparatus of religious worship,

* Dr. Whately is not aware, perhaps, that in this representation, he sanctions the acute remarks of Hume, cited in our review of Mr. Stratten's "*Book of the Priesthood*." See p. 532 of our last volume. (Dec. 1830.)

which is still piacular, though not vicarious. Nor would the doctrine of a heavenly Mediator through whom such personal service or obedience is rendered efficacious, form so broad a mark of distinction as may at first sight be imagined. The devout Mussulman trusts in the mediation of *his* Prophet for the acceptableness of his meritorious acts of genuflexion, fasting, alms, and pilgrimage, and thus ascribes his salvation to the merits of another. He would admit, probably, with the Romanist, that 'nothing we can do can be acceptable before God, except for the sake of that One Mediator'—allow him only to substitute the name of Mohammed for that of Christ. In *his* religion, there is no vicarious priesthood, scarcely any thing that can be termed priestcraft. In this respect, it comes much nearer than Popery to primitive Christianity. In what, then, consists the total opposition between the Religion of the Koran and that of the New Testament? Chiefly in this; that alike by the acts of unmeaning superstition and of meritorious conduct which his religion inculcates, the Mohammedan devotee seeks to propitiate God, and to deserve or purchase at once immunity from future punishment and the rewards of a sensual paradise.

This is the religion of nature, Justification by Works; the religion, under specious disguises, of thousands who profess and call themselves Christians, within the pale of the Established Church. This is that cardinal error, obscurely designated as 'self-righteousness', against which, like the Reformers of other times, the evangelical teachers of our own day so zealously contend. Of the extent to which this error has blended itself with the popular theology of the English Church, no proof more striking could be given, than is afforded by the language of so acute and learned a writer as Dr. Whately. That *he* should have been led to regard 'the abstract question' between the Romanists and Protestants on this point as 'chiefly verbal', and to overlook the all-important distinction between the merit or acceptableness of virtuous actions, and their supposed *propitiatory* value, can be explained only by the powerful bias of educational prejudice. Actuated by a sincere and ardent love of truth, he has emancipated himself from the trammels of authority, and, with the Scriptures as a lamp unto his feet, has discovered for himself much that has hitherto been hidden from many of the wise and prudent. But he has yet to learn some things which have long been familiar to babes in wisdom,—to many of those persons whom he would class, perhaps, among 'fanatical pietists', and charge with spiritual pride, owing to a misapprehension of the ground of the happy assurance they entertain that their sins are blotted out. He has yet to discover in its full-orbed beauty and originality, the

glorious doctrine, that Christ has made our peace with the Father; that God, as the Moral Governor of a rebel world, is reconciled and appeased; that nothing remains to be done by us, even were the thing in itself possible, to forward our salvation in this respect; that the reconciliation which the Gospel proclaims, is to be accepted, not to be earned, in order that a religion of love, and generous obedience, and child-like assurance, may take the place, in the heart of the pardoned sinner, of the religion of fear, which is the religion of the unregenerate heart. He has yet to perceive that this faith is the only foundation of virtue; that the maintaining of the utter nullity and worthlessness of the most self-denying penitence, the most meritorious actions, the richest accumulation of good works, for the purpose of expiating our sins or appeasing a just God,—leaves in undiminished force all the reasons for obedience, all the motives to virtue; that the assurance of forgiveness and ‘inspiration,’ which he deems fanatical, is capable of becoming the most powerful incentive to work out our salvation with fear and trembling. How much is there that the Christian Athens cannot teach!

We have sometimes thought, that it might answer the purpose of familiar illustration, to suppose a case, absurd and improbable indeed to the last degree, yet, in some sort parallel to that of a sinful man seeking to satisfy the justice of God by his reluctant service. Let us imagine a husbandman, placed in some dark region over which the night of ignorance has long rested, and who, utterly unacquainted with the laws of vegetation and the mysteries of nature, is taught by his priests to believe, that, by performing certain ceremonies of turning up the ground and scattering a multitude of grains, he propitiates the gods who preside over the earth, and induces them to bestow in return the fruits of the soil. What would be the natural effect of this persuasion? Would he not be apt to regard the prescribed performance as a very irksome task, and to content himself with the most careless and grudging discharge of a service to him so unmeaning? Or, if his anxiety for success led him to observe the utmost diligence and precision in executing it, would he not be liable to a thousand apprehensions, as well as to some serious mistakes that might mar his toil? And would he not receive the reward of his labour as that which he had wrung from the reluctant gods, rather than as the marks of their bounty? Now, then, let us suppose some officious philosopher addressing the poor peasant in this wise: ‘My friend, you are deceived altogether as to the nature of your performance and the cause of its success. Your hoeing and sowing the ground can have no effect in satisfying or propitiating the gods: for this purpose, your toil would be all

‘ thrown away. Had not the Goodness of Heaven been before-hand with you, and ensured the success of your operations by the fixed economy of vegetation, nothing you could do would make the earth bring forth. But go on, and be assured, that, according as you sow, so shall you reap. Heaven will reward your confidence, and bless your industry.’ Who does not see how this explanation would infallibly cut the sinews of exertion, and destroy all the poor man’s relish for husbandry? Would he not at once cease from his good works? So, to be consistent, some theologians would tell us. Others would say:— ‘ Why disturb the poor man’s mind with such subtle distinctions? What does it signify, whether he fancies that he bribes the gods by his labour, or that he toils from more enlightened motives? Sowing is sowing, whatever the man may think of the matter,—whether he thank his stars, or curse the gods for imposing such labour upon him. Leave him to go on in his own way.’

Not so Dr. Whately, who is the uncompromising enemy of all superstition on the one hand, and of all pious frauds on the other. We transcribe with pleasure the following just and important sentiments.

‘ The temptation to deceive, either positively or negatively*, i. e. either by introducing or by tolerating error, is one of the strongest that assail our frail nature, in cases where the conscience is soothed by our having in view what we believe to be a good end, and where that end seems hardly attainable but by fraudulent means. For the path of falsehood, though in reality slippery and dangerous, will often be the most obvious and seemingly the shortest. Accordingly, nothing is more common, among the indolent and thoughtless, when entrusted with the management of children, than to resort to this compendious way of controlling them; for the employment of deceit with those who are so easily deceived, will often serve a present turn much better than scrupulous veracity, though at the expense of tenfold ultimate inconvenience.’ p. 144.

Some of the ‘ conceivable cases’ adduced by the Author as specimens of pious frauds, are not a little curious; but they evince the honourable integrity and fearless independence which strikingly characterize his writings.

‘ Let us imagine a case of some one desirous to receive, and induce others to receive, the rite of Confirmation, from supposing it alluded to and enjoined in the passage of Scripture which describes an apostle as going through a certain region “ confirming the churches” (ἐπιστηρίζων);

* Of the guilt of negative deception, Dr. Whately might have drawn a striking and authoritative illustration from John viii. 55.

should we venture to attempt removing his conviction from this false basis, and replacing it on a sound one?

‘ If, again, we should meet with a case of Christians having a deep reverence for all the rites and circumstances of Christian burial, founded on a persuasion that the souls of those whose bodies are interred in consecrated ground, after the performance of the funeral service, are in a more safe state than they would otherwise have been, might not a danger be apprehended, of impairing their respect for the ministers of religion and the services of the Church, by inculcating the groundlessness of that persuasion? And might not therefore a minister be tempted, in such a case, to leave undisturbed an error which he could not charge himself with having directly introduced?

‘ Once more; imagine the case of a man long hardened in irreligious carelessness or gross vices, conscience-stricken on his death-bed, professing sincere repentance, and earnestly wishing for, and seeming to implore, a positive assurance, from the minister of his acceptance with God, and his eternal happiness in the next world;—a wish in which the relatives and friends around him should strongly join; and suppose the minister to be one who could not satisfy his own mind that he had any authority in Scripture for speaking positively in such a case; would he not be exposed to a temptation of feigning a confidence he did not feel, for the sake of smoothing the death-bed of one for whom nothing else could be done, and administering comfort to the afflicted survivors?

‘ And if a person so situated were anxious to receive the Eucharist, though he were (suppose) from ignorance respecting religion, and long continuance in careless or depraved habits, combined with the distractions of bodily pain, and the feebleness of mind resulting from disease, utterly incapable of being made to understand the nature of Christian Repentance, or the doctrine of Christian Redemption, or the right use of that Sacrament which he craved for as a kind of magical charm; (with the same kind of superstitious confidence which the Papists place in their Extreme-Uction;) would not the minister be tempted to shut his eyes to the unfitness of such a candidate—to the consequent nullity of the Ordinance, as far as that recipient is concerned—and to the profanation of so celebrating it? And if, moreover, we suppose some fanatical teacher to be at hand ready to make confident promises of salvation if *we* speak doubtfully, and to administer the sacred Ordinance if *we* withhold it—and that he would in that case win many converts, while we should incur odium, as wanting in charity; we must admit that, in such a case as here supposed, the temptation would be very strong, to any but a devoted lover of truth, to connive at error, as the less of the evils before him. And the temptation would be much the stronger both in this and in the other supposed cases, if we imagine them presented to a person who (as might easily be the case) had no distinct perception of the ultimate *dangers* of deceit—of the crowd of errors likely to spring from one—the necessity of supporting hereafter one falsehood by another, to infinity—and the liability to bring truth into discredit by blending it with the untrue; dangers which are recognized in the popular wisdom of appropriate proverbs. These ill

consequences may very easily be overlooked in each particular instance: for, though it is a just maxim, that falsehood is inexpedient in the long run, it is a maxim which it requires no small experience and reach of thought fully and practically to comprehend, and readily to apply: the only safe guide for the great mass of mankind, is the abhorrence of falsehood for its own sake, without looking to its consequences.'

Of the superstition existing among multitudes in this country, in relation to the Eucharist, Dr. Whately, in his first chapter, adduces some flagrant and melancholy instances; and he shews, that such superstition, 'instead of promoting, as some persons 'vainly imagine, true Religion, stands in the place of it.' 'Do pray, dear sir, give me the sacrament first, and then talk 'as much as you please',—is an answer by which, our Author assures us, he has known a sick man perseveringly repel the attempts of the minister to examine into the state of his mind, and to impart to him the requisite instruction. Again, as to the superstition cherished by the burial-service, Dr. Whately says:

'I have known a person, in speaking of a deceased neighbour, whose character had been irreligious and profligate, remark, how great a comfort it was to hear the words of the funeral-service read over her, "because, poor woman, she had been such a bad liver." I have heard of an instance again, of a superstition probably before unsuspected, being accidentally brought to light, by the minister's having forbidden a particular corpse to be brought into the church, because the person had never frequented it when alive: the consequence of which was, that many old people began immediately to frequent the church, who had before been in the habit of absenting themselves.' p. 70.

It is impossible that Dr. Whately should not be painfully sensible of the gross impropriety of the practice imposed upon every clergyman, of reading the service indiscriminately over good or 'bad livers.' With his views, the ordinary functions of a parish priest must involve a sort of perpetual martyrdom. Why do not such men as he boldly come forward to solicit and procure emancipation from "a yoke which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear?" The following remarks on some of the prevailing characteristics of superstition, are highly deserving of attention.

'The tendency to disjoin religious observances (*i. e.* what are intended to be such) from heartfelt and practical religion, is one of the most besetting evils of our corrupt nature; and it is the very root of most superstitions. Now no one can fail to perceive how opposite this is to true piety. Empty forms not only supersede piety by standing in its place, but gradually alter the habits of the mind, and render it unfit for the exercise of genuine pious sentiment. Even the natural food of religion (if I may so speak) is thus converted into its poison. Our very prayers, for example, and our perusal of the holy Scriptures, become superstitious, in proportion as any one expects them to operate

as a charm—attributing efficacy to the mere words, while his feelings and thoughts are not occupied in what he is doing.

‘Every religious ceremony or exercise, however well calculated, in itself, to improve the heart, is liable, as I have said, thus to degenerate into a mere form, and consequently to become superstitious; but in proportion as the outward observances are the more complex and operose, and the more unmeaning or unintelligible, the more danger is there of superstitiously attaching a sort of magical efficacy to the bare outward act, independent of mental devotion. If, for example, even our prayers are liable, without constant watchfulness, to become a superstitious form, by our “honouring God with our lips, while our heart is far from Him,” this result is almost unavoidable when the prayers are recited in an unknown tongue, and with a prescribed number of vain repetitions, crossings, and telling of beads. And men of a timorous mind, having once taken up a wrong notion of what religion consists in, seek a refuge from doubt and anxiety, a substitute for inward piety, and, too often, a compensation for an evil life, in an endless multiplication of superstitious observances;—of pilgrimages, sprinklings with holy water, veneration of relics, and the like. And hence the enormous accumulation of superstitions, which, in the course of many centuries, gradually arose in the Romish and Greek Churches.’ pp. 38—40.

And it is not a little remarkable, Dr. Whately proceeds to observe, that, in many instances, superstition not only does not promote true religion, but even tends to generate *profaneness*; in respect, too, of the very objects of superstitious reverence. He cites, in proof of this, from Doblado’s Letters, an account of the strange mixture of extravagant superstition and indecent levity and wit, which is exhibited in the shows and ceremonies of Good Friday, in some parts of Spain. Abundant evidence might be adduced of a similar kind. Mr. Blunt tells us, that, ‘when disappointed by his tutelary saints, an Italian or Sicilian will sometimes proceed so far as to heap reproaches, curses, and even blows on the wax, wood, or stone, which represents them’*; and he shews, that the ancient Romans treated their gods with similar freedom.

—— ‘*Injustos rabidis pulsare querelis
Cælicolas solamen erat.*’——Stat. Sylv. v. 22.

The Hindoos are in like manner described as reviling their gods in the grossest terms, on the occasion of any untoward event. Something strictly analogous to this, is but too notoriously prevalent among nominal Protestants.

‘In this country, a large proportion of the superstition that exists, is connected more or less with the agency of evil spirits; and accordingly

* Blunt’s “Vestiges of Ancient Manners and Customs in Modern Italy.” p. 125.

(in conformity with the strange principle of our nature just mentioned) nothing is so common a theme of profane jests among the vulgar of all ranks, as the Devil, and every thing relating to that Being, including the "everlasting fire prepared for him and his angels;" and this, by no means exclusively, or chiefly, among such as disbelieve what Scripture says on the subject; but, on the contrary, even the most, among those who give credit to a multitude of legendary tales also, quite unwarranted by Scripture.

'This curious anomaly may perhaps be, in a great measure at least, accounted for, from the consideration, that as Superstition imposes a yoke rather of fear than of love, her votaries are glad to *take revenge*, as it were, when galled by this yoke, and to indemnify themselves in some degree both for the irksomeness of their restraints and tasks, and also for the *degradation*, (some sense of which is always excited by a consciousness of slavish dread,) by taking liberties, *wherever they dare*, either in the way of insult or of playfulness, with the objects of their dread. And jests on sacred subjects, it is well known, are, when men are so disposed, the most easily produced of any; because the *contrast* between a dignified and a low image, exhibited in combination, (in which the whole force of the ludicrous consists,) is in this case the most striking.

'But how comes it that they ever do *dare*, as we see is the fact, to take these liberties? Another characteristic of Superstition will perhaps explain this also. It is, as I have just said, characteristic of Superstition to enjoin, and to attribute efficacy to, the mere performance of some specific outward acts—the use of some material object, without any loyal, affectionate devotion of heart being required to accompany such acts, and to pervade the whole life as a ruling motive. Hence, the rigid observance of the precise directions given, leaves the votary secure, at ease in conscience, and at liberty, as well as in a disposition, to indulge in profaneness. In like manner, a patient, who dares not refuse to swallow a nauseous dose, and to confine himself to a strict regimen, yet is both vexed and somewhat ashamed of submitting to the annoyance, will sometimes take his revenge, as it were, by abusive ridicule of his medical attendant and his drugs; knowing that this will not, so long as he does but take the medicine, diminish their efficacy. Superstitious observances are a kind of distasteful or disgusting remedy, which however is to operate if it be but swallowed, and on which accordingly the votary sometimes ventures gladly to revenge himself.'

pp. 41—44.

It would be easy to multiply citations from these pages, of an instructive and interesting cast; but we must pass on to notice very briefly the remaining chapters. The fourth, which treats of an 'undue reliance on human authority', is of a more desultory and unsatisfactory character than the preceding ones, but abounds with valuable remarks. Dr. Whately is anxious to disavow, on behalf of his Church, claims which the language of her formularies *seems* at least to favour, and for which the majority of his brethren have ever been found zealous to contend.

He would resolve the whole *authority* of the Church in controversies of faith, into such an authority as attaches to the historian or the philosopher. But still, he ingenuously admits, 'the use of the word authority in the sense of *power*, is so common, that it has, I have no doubt, aided in producing the impression, that a claim is advanced by the Church, of being 'an infallible interpreter of Scripture.' (p. 193.) Surely, then, he must wish to have the phraseology of the article in question amended, if not to see the entire article expunged. Again, he remarks, that 'Our Church' does not, like the Romish, denounce as '*heretics*', the members of other churches, not claiming any spiritual authority over those who are not within its pale. Yet, in denouncing the members of other churches as schismatics, if not as heretics, does it not equally lay claim to a jurisdiction beyond its pale? Our Author is no advocate, however, of the perfection of the Church to which he belongs; fully aware, that 'the claim to exemption from all error, shuts the 'door against reform'; and he points out how the danger of virtually substituting human authority for Divine, is increased by the use of human expositions of Scripture, such as creeds, articles, and catechisms, as well as of liturgical formularies. The following remarks we cannot suppress.

'It is a circumstance not a little remarkable, that they' (the inspired Writers) 'should all of them have thus abstained from committing to writing (what they must have been in the habit of employing orally) a Catechism, or course of elementary instruction in Christianity, consisting of a regular series of unquestionable Canons of doctrine—Articles of faith duly explained and developed—in short, a compendium of the Christian religion; which we may be sure (had such ever existed) would have been carefully transmitted to posterity. This, I say, must appear to every one, on a little reflexion, something remarkable; but it strikes me as literally *miraculous*. I mean, that the procedure appears to me dictated by a wisdom more than human; and that the Apostles and their immediate followers must have been *supernaturally withheld* from taking a course which would *naturally* appear to them the most expedient. Considering how very great must have been the total number of all the Elders and Catechists appointed, in various places, by the Apostles, and by those whom they commissioned, it seems hardly credible, that no one of these should have thought of doing what must have seemed so obvious, as to write, under the superintendence and correction of the Apostles, some such manual for the use of his hearers: as was in fact done, repeatedly, in *subsequent ages*, (i. e. after, as we hold, the age of *inspiration* was past,) in all the Churches where any activity existed. Thus much, at least, appears to me indubitable; that Impostors would have taken sedulous care (as Mahomet did) to set forth a complete course of instructions in their Faith; and that Enthusiasts would never have failed, *some* of them at least, to fall into the same plan; so that an

omission which is, on all human principles, unaccountable, amounts to a moral demonstration of the divine origin of our religion. And this argument, we should observe, is not drawn from the supposed *wisdom* of such an appointment: it holds good equally, however little we may perceive the expediency of the course actually pursued; for that which cannot have come from *Man*, must have come from *God*. If the Apostles were neither enthusiasts nor impostors, they must have been inspired; whether we can understand, or not, the reasons of the procedure which the Holy Spirit dictated.

‘In this case, however, attentive consideration may explain to us these reasons. God’s wisdom doubtless designed to guard us against a danger, which I think no human wisdom would have foreseen—the danger of indolently assenting to, and committing to memory, a “form of sound words”; which would in a short time have become no more than a form of words;—received with passive reverence, and scrupulously retained in the mind—leaving no room for doubt—furnishing no call for vigilant investigation—affording no stimulus to the attention, and making no vivid impression on the heart. It is only when the understanding is kept on the stretch by the diligent search—the watchful observation—the careful deduction—which the Christian Scriptures call forth, by their oblique, incidental, and irregular mode of conveying the knowledge of Christian doctrines—it is then only, that the Feelings, and the Moral portion of our nature, are kept so awake as to receive the requisite impression: and it is thus accordingly that Divine wisdom has provided for our wants, “*Curis acuens mortalia corda*”.

‘It should be observed, also, that a single systematic course of instruction, carrying with it divine authority, would have superseded the framing of any *others*,—nay, would have made even the alteration of a single word of what would, on this supposition, have been *Scripture*, appear an impious presumption; and yet could not possibly have been well-adapted for all the varieties of station, sex, age, intellectual power, education, taste, and habits of thought. So that there would have been an almost inevitable danger, that such an authoritative list of credenda would have been regarded by a large proportion of Christians with a blind and unthinking reverence, which would have excited no influence on the character; they would have had “a form of godliness; but denying the power thereof,” the form itself would have remained with them only as the corpse of departed Religion.

‘Such then being the care with which God’s providence has guarded against leading us into this temptation, it behoves us to be careful that we lead not ourselves into temptation, nor yield to those which the natural propensities of the human heart present. For, through the operation of those principles which I have so earnestly, and perhaps too copiously, dwelt on, we are always under more or less temptation to exalt some human exposition of the faith to a practical equality with the Scriptures, by devoting to that our chief attention, and making to it our habitual appeal.

‘And why, it may be said, should we scruple to do this? giving to Scripture the precedence, indeed, in point of dignity, as the foundation on which the other is built, but regarding the superstructure as

no less firm than the foundation on which it is fairly built? "I am fully convinced," a man may say, "that such an exposition conveys the genuine doctrines of the Scriptures: in which case it must be no less true than they; and may, therefore, by those who receive it, be no less confidently appealed to. Supposing us fully to believe its truth, it answers to us the purpose of Scripture: since we can *but* fully believe *that*. For in mathematics, for instance, we are not more certain of the axioms and elementary propositions, than we are of those other propositions which are proved from them: nor is there any need to go back at every step to those first theorems which are the foundation of the whole."

'The principle which I have here stated, as favourably as I am able, is one which, I believe, is often not distinctly stated, even inwardly in thought, by multitudes who feel and act conformably to it.

'One obvious answer which might be given to such reasoning is, that to assign to the deductions of uninspired men the same perfect certainty as belongs to mathematical demonstrations, and to repose the same entire confidence in their expositions of Scripture, as in Scripture itself, is manifestly to confer on those men the attribute of infallibility. Believe indeed, we must, in the truth of our own opinions: nor need it be such a wavering and hesitating belief, as to leave us incessantly tormented by uneasy doubts: but if we censure the Romish Church for declaring herself not liable to error, we must, for very shame, confess our own liability to it, not in mere words, but in practice; by being ever ready to listen to argument—ever open to conviction;—by continually appealing and referring at every step "to the Law and to the Testimony"—by continually tracing up the stream of religious knowledge to the pure fountain-head—the living waters of the Scriptures.' pp. 199—205.

The chapter on Persecution is admirable throughout. We cannot, indeed, conceal our satisfaction at finding principles which we have long struggled to maintain, at the cost of exposing ourselves to no small misrepresentation and obloquy, so explicitly avowed and so ably defended by a person of Dr. Whately's station and attainments. Upon no subject do more mistaken opinions prevail; and to the correction of these popular mistakes, our Author has particularly addressed himself. In opposition to one of these false notions, we meet with the important remark, worthy to be treasured up as an axiom, that 'Persecution is not wrong, because it is cruel; but it is cruel, because it is wrong.' Nor is it correct to characterise persecution as consisting in the infliction of punishment for the gratification of revenge or malice. 'What candid (or even uncandid) student of history,' asks Dr. W., 'can believe Cranmer' (or, we would say, Calvin) 'cruel and revengeful? Yet, he sanctioned the cutting off of heretics by the secular arm, from a sincere, though erroneous sense of duty.' The following remarks require from us no commendation or comment.

‘The ultimate penalty accordingly, in this world, with which the Author of our Religion thought fit to sanction it, was (with the exception of a few cases of miraculous interference) the exclusion of the offender from the religious community which he had scandalized: “if he refuse to hear the Church, let him be unto you as a heathen man and as a publican:” if he would not listen when repeatedly admonished, he was to be removed from the Society. And it is worthy of being remarked, that the Romish Church itself claims no right to punish those who do *not* belong to the Society: a “*heathen man*” does not come under her jurisdiction. In order therefore to retain the right of coercion over all who have been baptized, even by such as she accounts heretics, the Romanists affect to regard them as truly members, though rebellious subjects, of the Catholic Church. In literal and direct opposition to our Lord’s words, though censuring them for “refusing to hear the Church,” they yet will *not* regard them in the light of “heathen men.”

‘The language of the Apostle Paul corresponds with his Master’s: “a man that is an heretic, and after the first and second admonition, reject.” But no personal violence—no secular penalty whatever, is denounced against heretics and schismatics—“heathen men and publicans.” The whole of the New Testament breathes a spirit of earnestness indeed in the cause of truth, and zeal against religious error; but of such a zeal as was to manifest itself only in vehement and persevering persuasion.

‘This, which the Romanists cannot deny, they are driven to explain away, by saying, that the Apostles and other early Christians were *unable* to compel men to a conformity to the true faith; they abstained from the use of secular force, because (I cite the words of Augustine, a favourite authority with the Romanists) “that prophecy was not yet fulfilled, Be wise now therefore, O ye kings; be learned, ye that are judges of the earth; serve the Lord with fear.” The rulers of the earth, he adds, were at that time opposed to the Gospel; and *therefore* it was that the secular arm was not called in against the Church’s enemies.

‘But the Romanists might be asked in reply, if indeed such an argument be worth a reply, *why* the Apostles had not this power. Surely their Master could have bestowed it;—He unto whom “all power was given, in heaven and in earth:”—He who declared that the Father was ready to send him “more than twelve legions of angels:” whose force, as it would have destroyed all idea of resistance, would at once have established his religion, without any need of a resort to *actual* persecution. Or, if for any hidden reasons, the time was not yet come for conferring on his disciples that coercive power which was to be afterwards justifiably employed in his cause, we might expect that He would have given notice to them of the change of system which was to take place. But had He designed any such change, his declaration to Pilate would have been little else than an equivocation worthy of the school of the very Jesuits. Had He declared that “his kingdom was not of this world,” meaning, that though such was the case, *then*, He meant it to be supported by secular force hereafter, and consequently to *become* a kingdom of this world;—and that his ser-

vants were not allowed to fight in his cause ; with the mental reservation, that they were hereafter to do so ;—He would have fully justified the suspicion which was probably entertained by many of the heathen magistrates, that the Christians and their Master did, notwithstanding their professions, secretly meditate the establishment of a kingdom supported by secular force ; and that though they disavowed this principle, and abstained from all violent methods, this was only a mask assumed during the weakness of their infant power, which they would (according to the principle which Augustine avows) throw aside as soon as they should have obtained sufficient strength.

‘ But the very idea is blasphemous, of attributing such a subterfuge to Him who “ came into the world that He might bear witness of the truth.” The immediate occasion indeed of our Lord’s *making this declaration*, to Pilate, was his desire to do away the expectation so strongly prevailing both among Jews and Gentiles, of a temporal Messiah about to establish a triumphant kingdom : but no occasion would have led Him to make the declaration, had it not been *true* : and it would *not* have been true, had He meant no more than that his kingdom was spiritual, in the sense of its having dominion over the souls of men, and holding out the glories and the judgements of the other world ; for this was what the infidel Jews expected, and expect to this day : they look for a kingdom both of this world and also of the next ;—for a Messiah who shall bestow on his followers not only worldly power and splendour, but also the spiritual blessings of a future state, besides. They did indeed expect the Messiah to reign over them for ever in bodily person : but the main part of their expectation would have been fulfilled, had He merely *founded* a temporal kingdom, and delegated (as the Lord did of old, to the kings) his power, to his anointed, in whom his spirit should dwell. Jesus accordingly not only *claimed spiritual* dominion, but *renounced* temporal : He declared not merely that his kingdom is one of the *next* world, but that it is *not* of *this* world.

‘ All the declarations, however—all the direct and indirect teaching—of Scripture, is unavailing to the uncandid inquirer, who seeks in these books, not a guide for his conduct, but a justification of it ; and who is bent on making the word of God, where it does not suit his views, “ of none effect, by the tradition ” of a supposed infallible Church, or by the subtleties of strained interpretations. But to a candid mind the instructions afforded by the Evangelists and Apostles appear to me not only sufficient to settle all questions relating to the subject of persecution, but also (to the generality of mankind) better adapted for that purpose than any arguments which human reason could supply.’ pp. 245—251.

Dr. Whately has some most valuable remarks on the notorious fact, that the feeling which tends to foster the spirit of persecution against infidels and heretics, is usually much stronger than our indignation against those who, professing our religion, disgrace it by an unchristian life. ‘ With the early Christians, ‘ the case must have been reversed.’ Not less deserving of notice is another striking fact ; that ‘ those who are anxious to re-

tain within the pale of the Church, such professing Christians as lead a careless or immoral life, are not found to feel any thing like a proportionate tenderness towards differences of opinion. On the contrary,' adds Dr. W., 'they are usually the foremost in exaggerating into fatal heresy, the smallest shade of variation from their own views of orthodoxy, and the loudest in urging all those openly and at once to separate from the Church, whose notions do not appear minutely to coincide with their own.' Dr. Whately is the decided advocate of the most comprehensive toleration. 'Coercive means,' he remarks, 'cannot suitably be employed for either the propagation or the maintenance of Christianity.' Upon Christian principles, the interference of the civil magistrate, to whom is committed the care of the temporal welfare of the community, must be limited 'to those cases in which the persons or property of the citizens are directly and confessedly concerned.' Those principles leave no 'opening for the forcible suppression, or for the forcible establishment, by the civil magistrate, of any religion whatever.'

We will not charge Dr. Whately with 'stealing our thunder.' We have not the arrogance to claim him as a disciple or a convert; but we do congratulate ourselves upon the accession of so powerful an auxiliary. Sentiments which, under the uninviting title of 'Protestant Nonconformity,' have failed to gain assent, may be listened to with respectful deference when thus promulgated *ex cathedrâ*. Let us not be misunderstood, as if we imputed to our Author any bias towards Dissenterism, or any disposition to symbolize with Congregationalists in their notions of ecclesiastical polity. Against much that they would be apt to contend for, *he* would perhaps strenuously object; but all the views which he has so admirably illustrated in these Essays, they have long entertained. We may venture, indeed, to assert, that there is scarcely a position that we have cited from Dr. Whately, that will not be found, in substance, in Mr. Conder's work, from which, in one of the Bampton Lectures of 1819, copious extracts were made, with a view to their confutation. If the volume referred to never fell into Dr. Whately's hands, the coincidence is the more satisfactory, as shewing the near agreement of collateral inquiries, originating in very opposite quarters, and instituted with very different intentions.

But are Protestant Dissenters in no danger of falling into the errors here exposed, inherent as they are in our common nature? To some of them, the Nonconformist may be less liable than the Churchman, as the Churchman is less liable than the Romanist; but a false security, as Dr. Whately justly remarks, is itself one of the most fatal of those errors. Let Dissenters then receive the admonition addressed by our Author to the members of his own community.

134 *Lectures on the Apocalypse* by Jones and Others.

‘We are, in fact, imitating the Romanists, if we securely exult in our separation from them; if we trust in the name of Protestant, as they do in that of Catholic, and look back, with proud satisfaction, on our emancipation from their corrupt system, without also looking forward, to guard vigilantly against the like corruptions: even as they triumphed in their abandonment of Pagan superstitions, while they forgot that Paganism itself was the offspring of the self-deceiving heart of man, in which the same corruptions, if not watchfully repressed, will be continually springing up afresh.’ p. 317.

Art. III. 1. *Lectures on the Apocalypse.* By William Jones, M.A. 8vo. pp. 613. Price 15s. London, 1830.

2. *Lectures, expository and practical, on the Book of Revelation.* By the late Rev. Robert Culbertson. 3 Vols. 8vo. pp. 1560. Price 1l. 10s. London.

3. *Practical Sermons on the Epistles to the Seven Churches, the Millennium and the Church Triumphant, and the CXXXth Psalm.* By the late Rev. Joseph Milner, M.A., Vicar of the Holy Trinity Church, Kingston upon Hull. With prefatory Remarks by the Rev. Edward Bickersteth, Vicar of Sir George Wheler’s Chapel. 8vo. pp. xxiv. 392. Price 10s. London, Seeley, 1830.

4. *An Inquiry into the Origin of Opinions relative to an Expected Millennium.* By William Vint. 8vo. pp. 130. Price 2s. London, Baynes, 1830.

THE Apocalypse is a book which some of the most celebrated commentators have designedly omitted in their expositions of the New Testament. ‘*Calvinus sapuit,*’ says Scaliger, ‘*quia non scripsit in Apocalypsin;*’ and Whitby thought himself incompetent to the task of elucidating its symbols and explaining its language, ‘having,’ as he confesses, ‘neither sufficient reading nor judgement, to discern the true intendment of the prophecies contained in this book.’ To others, however, it has evidently been one of the most attractive portions of the sacred Volume, and has been selected by not a few theological writers, as an appropriate field in which to exercise their ingenuity, and to display their learning. Instances might easily be produced, of the flippant and prejudiced perversion of the book in accommodation to occurrences of temporary interest; but the very names of such men as Mede, and Lowman, and Vitringa, are sufficient vouchers that, in the illustration of the Apocalypse, the most solid and extensive erudition, combined with sobriety of judgement and the most entire honesty of purpose, has been employed. To these names, distinguished as they are, we need not hesitate to add that of Dean Woodhouse. Other writers of inferior pretensions have from time to time endeavoured to interest the religious part of the community in the ‘Revelation,’ by compendious and popular representations of its contents.

To this class belong the 'Lectures' of Mr. Jones, which have evidently been prepared with much careful attention and cost of labour, and which we may safely recommend as a very useful work, well calculated to serve the Author's purpose of furnishing a popular digest of the most valuable comments on the Apocalypse. Opinions are sometimes hazarded at variance with the most approved of his predecessors; but, in his unborrowed illustrations, we occasionally find him supporting his conclusions with reasons which it would not be very easy to invalidate. The leading distinction of his work is, the continual reference to the original state of the Christian profession, and to the scriptural character of the primitive institutions of Christianity. If the design of the Apocalypse be, to trace out the progress of the gospel, and the vicissitudes of its history, nothing can be more obvious than the position zealously maintained by the Author, that a knowledge of the primitive state of the religion of Christ, is indispensable to the elucidation of the prophecies which respect its alternations; and that it is by a comparison of the several states in which the Christian profession has subsequently existed, with its original condition, that its corruptions are to be detected. As there can be no question that such is at least one purpose of the book of Revelation, the principles on which Mr. Jones conducts his interpretations, must be admitted to be the only correct ones, though we may not be able to concur with him in every particular comprised in his application of them.

Most writers who have offered their aid as interpreters of Christian prophecy, have, it must be acknowledged, very inadequately apprehended the import of the 'good confession' which Jesus Christ witnessed before Pontius Pilate; and, in consequence of this defective appreciation, they have been much less observant of the limits which distinguish the Church from the World, than was necessary to preserve them from great errors, and their followers from dangerous mistakes. Mr. Jones's readers will have no occasion to distrust him as their guide, in this respect; and some of them may probably find reason to suspect, that the view which they have been accustomed to take of the degeneracies and corruptions of professed Christian communities, is by far too much contracted. Among Protestants, it has been usual to consider the antichristian institutions of Europe as destined to be overthrown; and certainly such an expectation cannot be pronounced extravagant or unreasonable. It is not only as an inference from the *data* furnished in the Scriptures, that this catastrophe is looked for; the altered aspect of those institutions in some countries, and their extinction in others, may be thought to warrant a persuasion of the probability of the event. But what are the boundaries which include

antichristian institutions, and by what distinctions are they to be known? Is the usurpation of temporal authority a sign to be interpreted one way in the East, and another way in the West? We need supply no answer to these queries; but we cannot forbear to remark, in relation to their importance, that, for whatever is truly and essentially a part of the religion of Christ, and necessary for its preservation and extension in the world, there can be no cause for alarm or fear. It must be owned, however, that many Christians are very unwilling to inspect the form of primitive christianity. The chaste and beautiful simplicity of Christ's institutions is very unattractive to the eyes of many, who will look only where they can see the bravery of ornaments, and the pomp of circumstances. In the changes which such persons may deplore, the true adherent of a spiritual religion may receive confirmations of his faith, and consolations of his hope. There are, in all the mutations of the world, 'things which cannot be shaken,' and which will survive the destruction of the vanity and the pageantry of man's device.

To preceding expositors of the Apocalypse, Mr. Jones is under obligations which he is generally careful to acknowledge; and we are usually at no difficulty, by the guidance of his references, to trace the opinions he has adopted, to the writers from whom he has obtained them. He has, however, in respect to one primary source of his comments, scarcely rendered the necessary tribute of literary justice to an Annotator by whose labours he has been very considerably assisted in his lectures. We refer to the work of the Dean of Lichfield, whose interpretations are introduced into the present discourses, in such a manner as to induce the readers of them to regard them as the original suggestions of the Author. It is not only from the omission of the necessary references that such an impression will be produced, but, in addition to this, all preceding commentators are, in the instances to which we refer, so directly and strongly represented as in error, that no other supposition can occur to a reader than the one in question. In commencing his fifteenth Lecture, 'On the Third Seal,' Mr. Jones proceeds as follows:

'BRETHREN, before I enter upon the present lecture, and by way of preface to it, I must take leave to apprise you, that there is no part of the Apocalypse on which we have yet been called to pass a judgement, which has so much perplexed the commentators and others who have undertaken to illustrate this book, as the two verses now read, namely, the opening of the third seal. In proof of the truth of this remark, I may add, that one of the latest and most judicious writers on the subject has dismissed it in about twenty short lines, and those, unfortunately, but little to the purpose; from which I think it neither unreasonable nor uncandid to infer, that he despaired of throwing any

light upon it. Others, indeed, have written more copiously with that view, but, I am sorry to say, with scarcely better effect; for the amount of all that they have said upon the contents of the opened seal is simply this, that the symbol of the black horse and his rider—denotes that the Roman empire during an approaching period should suffer greatly from a scarcity of provisions.'

To this interpretation, Mr. Jones objects, that it divests the hieroglyphic of its main attributes, and reduces it to a literal history or prophecy.

'But, then,' he proceeds to say, 'you will ask me, if the literal famine which scourged the empire during the second century, be not the import of the *third seal*, what does it intend? I answer in few words; it is *the beginning of the corruption of Christianity, after the days of the apostles*, that is denoted by it. And, now, having put you in possession of the conclusion at which it is my object to arrive—'

As applied to Mede and his followers, the above remarks may be admitted; but, if our readers will look into Dr. Woodhouse's work, they will find, not only the explanation of the seal which is assumed by Mr. Jones to be an unpatronised one, but the very reasons which he himself has urged against the rejected interpretation. 'By these provisions, thus scarce and difficult 'of acquirement,' says Dr. Woodhouse, 'are we to understand 'wheat, barley, wine, and oil, in their plain and literal meaning? 'Assuredly not. The tenor of prophetic language forbids,— 'directing our attention as our Lord has directed it (see ch. ii. '7.) to scarcity of another kind, even that of which the prophet 'Amos speaks, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst of water, but 'of hearing the words of the Lord.—But when dark clouds of 'ignorance, denoted by the colour of the black horse, spread 'over the face of the christian world, and corrupt teachers could 'advance their worldly purposes by bringing their disciples 'under the yoke of superstition, the knowledge and practice of 'genuine religion became scarce.' Vitringa, too, noticed by Woodhouse, explains the scarcity to be, not of temporal provisions, but of spiritual blessings, and refers the period of this scarcity to the times from the age of Constantine to the ninth century.

Again, in his twenty-second 'Lecture,' Mr. Jones represents the whole of the 'commentators, expositors, and other 'learned writers, as explaining the judgements of the first trumpet as falling on the Roman empire, the body politic.' (p. 263.) In p. 271, he speaks of his being guided by a principle of interpretation which compelled him, in explaining the import of the *first* trumpet, to 'abandon the whole host of commentators and expositors.' Now, we have compared the interpretation of the first trumpet in Mr. Jones's volume, with the exposition of Dr. Woodhouse, and find the principle of the

former, an exact transcript of that which is proposed by the latter, which, indeed, had previously been suggested by Vitringa, and according to which the judgements of the first trumpet fall 'upon the professors of christianity, who are symbolized by the 'trees and the herbage, the third part of which is destroyed.' In reference to a note in Mr. Jones's work, p. 273, we judge it requisite to guard our readers against the impression which it is likely to produce, unfavourable to Dr. Woodhouse, as if he had failed to notice the corruptions of the true religion consequent on the elevation of Constantine to the throne of the Cæsars. On the subject of ecclesiastical establishments, neither Mr. Jones's views, nor our own, would accord with those of the Dean of Lichfield; but he has not subjected himself to censure by any unfair representations of Constantine's patronage of the Church, from whose advancement to the imperial power, he dates, as Mr. Jones himself does, the increasing debasement of the Church, and the rapidly advancing degeneracy of Christian professors corrupted by worldly prosperity.

At p. 278, Mr. Jones describes the distinction between the bishop and the presbyter, as an innovation first broached in the days of Constantine, 'which did not pass without remonstrance 'from the friends of truth at the time.' This strange error, we should attribute to some inexplicable confusion of times and circumstances in the Author's memory, since we cannot impute to him so defective a knowledge of ecclesiastical history as might be the origin of such a misrepresentation as this. The 'bishop' had been distinguished by the 'presbyter,' and raised to a higher elevation, long before the beginning of the fourth century. It was not against the power and arrogance of 'bishops,' as an innovation, that Ærius raised his voice: he opposed the order as a usurpation which had long existed, and was become intolerable; and endeavoured to revive, in conformity with the simplicity of the New Testament, correct notions of the office of christian pastors.

One rule of interpretation which would seem to be required for the consistent explanation of the Apocalypse, is, that a uniform sense be assigned to the same symbols, and a unity of principle be observed in the application of them. We find, however, in the existing Commentaries on this prophetic book, perpetual departures from this rule, in the varying meanings which they attach to the figurative representations which are identical, or coincident, in its visions. The adaptation of many of the events which have been selected by expositors as answering to the symbols supposed to denote them, is quite arbitrary. Mr. Jones has evidently been desirous to guide his interpretations by the rule to which we have referred, yet, like many of his predecessors, he fails in the consistency of his explanations.

We may refer for an example to his view of the Trumpets. After passing sentence against Lowman and others, for giving their suffrages to a mode of interpretation 'obviously foreign to the scope of the Apocalypse', he remarks, that—

'If we would rightly understand the first four trumpets, we must carefully consider the several notable degrees of the corruption of Christianity; the secularizing of the kingdom of Christ; the gradual change which was thereby brought upon the face of the Christian profession; and the several steps whereby Antichrist, the Man of Sin, arrived at his height from the very first beginning of his being revealed. But these are topics which unfortunately find no place in our modern treatises on the book of the Revelation; and this single consideration makes it the more important for us not to gloss it over superficially.'—p. 272.

The 'trees and herbage' of the first trumpet are accordingly (after Woodhouse), as we have already noticed, considered by the Author as denoting the primitive fruitful profession of Christianity; and the hurt inflicted on the Christian profession is understood by him as the effect of the symbolic 'hail and fire'. So, in the second trumpet, the 'sea' is the emblem of the professors of Christianity, that were within the bounds of the Roman empire (p. 274); and the change of a third part of this element into blood, on the falling of the mountain burning with fire that was cast upon it, is explained as follows.

'Life and death must here be understood, not in a literal, but metaphorical sense—as importing that a third part of the professors of Christianity that were in the sea or empire, had their *spiritual* life extinguished, and so perished in consequence of this burning mountain being cast into it. *Ships* are an emblem of commerce, and, taken metaphorically, what is this commerce but communion in spiritual matters or church privileges, and in the profession of Christianity, which was now marred and spoiled by impurity of communion, the unavoidable effect of amalgamating the church and the world: for, when Christianity had become the established religion of the empire, multitudes found access to the former, who sought nothing but worldly privileges, and these they obtained by strife and contention.'—p. 275.

But, on turning to the next Lecture, on the 'third trumpet', we find the unity of interpretation no longer regarded. The inroads of the Barbarians who overran the Empire, from the irruption of the Goths, after the death of Theodosius in 395, to the establishment of the Lombards in Italy, in 571, are the great star Wormwood falling from heaven, and destroying *literally* the lives of men. But, if the symbols of the first trumpet cannot refer to the subversion of the empire by the barbarous hordes who invaded it at all points (p. 262), we do not see with what propriety the third trumpet can be so explained. Dean Woodhouse has preserved consistency of principle in re-

ferring the effects of this trumpet to the introduction of heretical tenets, and by describing the death as spiritual. In this explanation of the symbols of the fifth trumpet, Mr. Jones represents the star falling from heaven as the emblem of an apostate from the faith, and refers it to the Romish Church, the clergy of which he understands as being symbolized by the locusts. But, if the falling of this star denotes a spiritual corruption and tyranny, why should the star falling from heaven, of the third trumpet, be assumed as an emblem, not of religious apostasy, but of political conquest and devastation?

The Two Witnesses (ch. xi.) have been explained by one class of expositors in reference to the Old and New Testaments; while, by another, they have been understood of a succession of living instructors, who, during the reign of Antichristian error and superstition, have borne testimony to the truth. Mr. Jones unites these opinions in his Comments, and interprets the Apocalyptic text which describes the Witnesses, as designating the sacred Scriptures of the Jewish and Christian economies, which might be said to prophesy by means of pious men and evangelical communities, raised up from time to time to exhibit the pure doctrines of revelation. Whatever may be said of this principle of interpretation, the details which Mr. Jones has adduced in the course of his illustrations of the chapter relating to the Witnesses, are neither so appropriate, nor so consistent, as to invest the interpretation itself with the characters of a true one. His explication is in some particulars improbable and contradictory. The event which he selects as having fulfilled the prophecy of the fall of the tenth part of the city (v. 13), is the taking of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453. A very slight examination of the chapter might have been sufficient to prevent the accommodation of that event to the passage to which it is here applied. As the fall of the tenth part of the city is subsequent to the ascension of the Witnesses, or at least coincident with it, and certainly not prior to it, the death and resurrection of the Witnesses, and the completion of the period of their prophesying, must all precede the catastrophe. But in Mr. Jones's exposition, they are not so arranged. The Witnesses, he says, were raised to life again, 'when Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin brought the Scriptures into public view, and pleaded their authority above that of all human testimony.' But this was long after the fall of Constantinople. Again, if the resurrection of the Witnesses be explained by the circulation of the Scriptures, which were rendered accessible by means of the art of printing, the prophecy cannot be supposed to have received its fulfilment before the application of the art to multiply copies of the Scriptures for public use. But in 1453, there was no extensive publication of the

Scriptures; nor was there a single instance, at that date, of any part of them being issued from the press, in a translation into any European language. Luther's German Version of the New Testament was not published before 1522, seventy years after the subversion of the Greek empire.

The taking of Constantinople by the Turks in 1453, cannot, therefore, on Mr. Jones's own shewing, be coincident with the ascension of the Witnesses. Besides, the Witnesses prophesy in sackcloth during the period of 1260 days, the time of the duration of the Antichristian usurpation; and the deduction of so many years from 1453, would give a date for the commencement of the reign of that corrupting and desolating tyranny, far too early to accord with the calculations which Mr. Jones adopts.

No one of the mysteries of the Apocalypse has proved more vexatious to the Commentators, than the enigmatical number of the Beast; and they all fail, in the solutions which they have proposed, to induce in us the persuasion that the true method of discovering its import has yet been tried. It is, indeed, quite curious to bring together the several calculations and assumed meanings which, from the time of Irenæus to the present, have been suggested in the explanation of the mystic number, and to observe their variations and inconsistencies. In respect to the whole of them, 'there is wanting,' as Woodhouse remarks, 'that flash of illumination, that lively sense of having passed 'from darkness to light, which so delightfully affects us upon 'the solution of a well-formed enigma.' Mr. Jones, however, has not been deterred, by either the difficulty of the subject, or the unsuccessful attempts of his predecessors, from endeavouring to penetrate into the secret. Neither the *Apostates* of Faber, nor the *Lateinos* of Irenæus can please him. These writers 'have not taken up the words of the prophet in a proper point 'of view;' and Mr. Jones, proceeding by means of a more simple method, giving promise of a more probable result, elicits from the numerals $\chi\xi\rho'$, expressing 666, the descriptive sentence, $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\iota\alpha\nu\omicron\iota \xi\epsilon\nu\omicron\iota \sigma\tau\alpha\upsilon\rho\upsilon$, *Christians, strangers to the cross*; and in prolonging the *Εὐγενία* produced by this discovery, he invites the concurrence of his readers, in the following terms.

'I appeal to yourselves whether this be not a very proper motto for the beast and his company—a character that, in one way or other, adapts itself to them all, and *none else but them!* Examine the fact, and form your own judgment on it. Here are myriads of *professed* Christians, but they are Christians only in name. Instead of taking up the cross, and following the Lamb whithersoever he goeth—instead of patiently suffering for his sake, they are worshipping the beast and his image to avoid the cross.

'To corroborate the view now given of the number of the beast, it

may be further observed, that in ch. vii. 4, the number of the *sealed* of the Lamb's company is expressed by three letters also, viz. ρ. μ. δ. And these again are the initials of three words, viz.

ῥηματος, μαρτυρες, διωκομενοι.

or, *The persecuted witnesses of the word*;

which is the very opposite of the former class of professors, and agrees exactly with the account which the Apocalypse gives of the followers of the Lamb in opposition to the worshippers of the beast.' p. 438.

The 'flash of illumination' does not accompany this proposed solution, and we must still wait for an interpreter who shall be more successful than the present Author, in finding out and applying the simple method of calculation by which we may obtain the result that shall conclude our inquiries on this perplexing subject. Mr. Culbertson has taken great pains with an hypothesis which he details at some length, and which is both ingenious and erudite, though it is not more worthy of our confidence than the preceding. In the number 666, he discovers an allusion to the Roman legion, the full complement of which was 6000 men, including 6 military tribunes, 60 centurions, and 600 decani; and the mystic number thus formed, he understands as intended to convey an intimation of the military character of the Papal church.

It would be but an unprofitable toil in a reviewer, to collate the various explanations which have been given of the contents of the Apocalypse; and, as an entire production, there is no exposition which it would be creditable to his discernment to recommend. Where, however, the obscurities are so great, and the subjects so diversified, as we find them in this book, we would rather applaud the patient researches and edifying labours of the writers who have been employed upon it, than indulge in censuring their interpretations. Our objections cannot, however, be misplaced, when they are directed to the violations of rules which the authors themselves assume as principles of interpretation, and which obviously require consistency in the application of them. We could easily have multiplied instances of this kind, occurring in the course of our progress through Mr. Jones's volume; but upon the whole, we may safely recommend it to our readers as an instructive and excellent work.

Mr. Culbertson's work escaped our notice at the time that, in the regular supply of our pages, its character and contents should have been reported to our readers. In its present form, the publication is a posthumous one; the portion which comprehends the exposition of the first three chapters of the Revelation, not having been included in the edition published by the Author, though he lived to prepare it for the press. The

events of the French Revolution seem to have furnished the excitement which led him to extend his original design of expounding only the addresses to the Seven Churches, to an exposition of the whole book; and some of his interpretations strongly indicate the influence which those events exerted upon his study of the Apocalypse. Unlike many contemporary expositors, however, whose object in applying to the events of that extraordinary convulsion the symbolic predictions of the book, was more closely connected with politics, than with religion, Mr. Culbertson manifests throughout his work, an entire freedom from the bias, so unfavourable to truth, which secular interests are apt to create; and if his views are not always so comprehensive as we could wish, respecting the rights of religious profession, his principles are always sound. The work affords honourable evidence of the talents and literary industry of the Author, and is highly creditable to the solidity and general correctness of his judgement. He appears to have possessed an extensive acquaintance with the historical facts, as well as the ancient manners and customs, which bear upon the language and subject of the predictions; and his elucidations are sometimes very ingenious. The Lectures preserve their original form as delivered by the Author to his congregation, and are severally concluded with devotional and practical reflections suggested by the subject; a feature of the work which will render it acceptable and instructive to all pious readers, even though they may not concur in all his interpretations of the prophetic parts of the Revelation. In this point of view, we know of no better exposition of this portion of the inspired volume.

The name of Joseph Milner will be a sufficient recommendation of any volume of sermons bearing his name; more especially sermons of a practical character. The present volume, published for the benefit of the Church Missionary Society, forms a fourth, in addition to those which have appeared under the editorship of Mr. Fawcett. It was at first intended, Mr. Bickersteth states, to publish only the Sermons on the Epistles to the Seven Churches; but the additional sermons have been supplied, at his request, from the MS. originals in Mr. Fawcett's possession. That on the Millennium, Mr. B. deems 'peculiarly important as conveying Mr. Milner's sentiments on 'a subject which engages much of the attention of Christians 'at the present moment.'

The sermon was written in 1796, and bears internal marks of its date. Speaking of the overthrow of the ecclesiastical establishment in France, Mr. Milner remarks, with his characteristic plainness of speech and strong sense, that, when Popery was demolished in our own land, 'it was not by murdering her

‘priests and destroying all civil order, but by wholesome laws
‘and rules, and by preaching the Gospel, and God was with
‘the Reformers.’

‘So foolish a religion as Popery is not likely to flourish again, where Scripture truth and godliness have been sown and flourished. But, as no one can pretend this to be the case in France, if Popery should there arise again in a few years, I should not be surprised; for what truth, and wisdom, and piety is there to resist it? I do not say, it will be so. I do not undertake to prophecy, nor to use any very probable guesses. I have no business with such things; and the design of this first remark is to guard those who may have fallen into this spirit. There is no ground, in this description of the Millennium, whence I can at all collect when it is to begin; and it is very foolish for persons to apprehend any for themselves. Events have shewn that those who have undertaken to prophesy in this way formerly, are commonly mistaken; and in the mean time, *it takes people’s attention off from better things, from the serious discharge of their duties.*’

pp. 274, 5.

Mr. Milner’s ideas of the nature of the Millennium, are briefly stated in the following paragraph.

‘The Apostolic Prophet had been shewn in vision the complete destruction of Popery and false religion, in the former chapters; and in this he is shewn the vision of what is called the Millennium, or the spiritual reign of Christ on earth for a thousand years, which will then take place;—a happy time of the Church, no doubt; for then, it seems, wickedness, though by no means extinct, will be subdued, and the world shall see, what hitherto it has not seen, the governments of the world truly Christian, and Christian godliness as common on earth as ungodliness now is. Now, though the Gospel in its own nature cannot be better than it is now, nor Christ more precious than he now is, yet the light, evidence, and glory of the Gospel will be much stronger in the eyes of men than they can be now. The good effects of the Gospel, in the world, in society, will be more sensibly apparent; and ten thousand objections now made against the Scriptures, will then vanish, without any need of arguments at all, like mists before the sun. At present, kingdoms and governments cannot shew so much the wholesomeness of Christianity, because the number of real Christians is small, and they too, for the most part, poor and of no influence in the great world. In families, and in private life, the Divine glory of the Gospel appears indeed as powerful as it can do then, in those instances where families and private men are real Christians.—If any serious soul be wishing, as it were, to see this glorious day of the Church on earth, I would say, However glorious it be, heaven itself is still unspeakably more glorious; and, therefore, let us not be deceived by such thoughts and wishes into a love of this earth, but still remember to “set our affections on things above.” Besides, there is no sort of probability that the youngest of us will ever live to see the Millennium.’ pp. 267—269.

Well would it be for the Church, if this sound and simple-minded view of the subject were more generally taken. The homely advice will, probably, excite a sneer in the 'students of 'prophecy;' but, if they are more knowing, it does not follow that they are more wise. The volume contains little that is of a critical or expository character, but well corresponds to its title, and is worthy of its estimable Author.

We have taken this opportunity of noticing Mr. Vint's tract, as bearing upon the general subject, for the purpose chiefly of clearing ourselves from a heavy charge in which we cannot but feel implicated, although not indicted by name. We are not, indeed, quite certain that the reverend Author, who describes himself as having been forty years a minister, and thirty years a Tutor, ever so much as heard of our obscure Journal; the Evangelical Magazine being apparently, if not his favourite work, that upon which he lays most stress, as a critical authority.

'Among the censors of literature,' he remarks, 'there are two modes of sinking a production of the pen into the gulf of oblivion; the one by preterition,—to adopt a theological term, the other by reprobation. The former is, perhaps, the more fatal of the two. Of this, I have had my full share. In the course of the last ten years, I have published eight octavo volumes, two in duodecimo, and three pamphlets; but not one of these has ever been noticed in the Review department of the Evangelical Magazine!'

Leaving the Editor of that Magazine to answer for himself, we would respectfully submit to the reverend Author, whether the question of either preterition or reprobation can be agitated, with any theological propriety, respecting the still-born. Of all malice prepense towards the offspring of his prolific pen, we must demand to be acquitted, not having had any cognizance of their existence. Had any of the ten volumes above-mentioned reached our hands, we should have been liable to account for the fatal treatment of them charged upon the Editor of the Evangelical Magazine. One work, indeed, the "Illustrations of Prophecy," we chanced to see advertised, and endeavoured to obtain a copy, but without success. Since then, a pamphlet has fallen into our hands, bearing the name of Mr. Vint, which, from respect to the Writer, we forbore to notice. It contained some strictures on a discourse by the said Editor of the Evangelical Magazine, so evidently inspired by strong personal feeling, and the attack seemed to us, not being in Mr. Vint's secret, so uncalled for and out of character, that we doomed it to preterition. It appears that the severity of those strictures has exposed the Author to rebuke. 'Perhaps,' he says, 'they are too severe; perhaps there is too thick a sprinkling of the Attic salt.' Not so; the salt was the simple muriate, and was without savour.

What the twelve octavo volumes and two duodecimos of Mr. Vint's works consist of, we have not the remotest idea; but, as he promises 'a second edition of *the whole* of what' he has 'published on the subject of prophecy,'—we hope the whole ten volumes are not on that subject,—we will engage, on receiving a copy of the same, to make the *amende honorable*, by duly reporting their contents to our readers. In the mean time, we shall briefly notice his present Inquiry.

The principal object of the Author in the pamphlet before us, is, 'to prove the truth of an assertion which,' he tells us, 'he has repeatedly made, namely, that the popular doctrine of the Millennium originated in a Jewish tradition.' This assertion, we had ourselves occasion to make, in an article devoted to an examination of the Millenarian heresy*; in which we endeavoured to shew, that the doctrine is the offspring of Jewish error, repugnant to the genius of Christianity, and adapted to weaken the influence of every consideration drawn from the joys or terrors of the world to come. We take to ourselves no credit, however, for the statement of an opinion which, had it been original, would have been suspicious, but which is as old as the days of Eusebius and Jerom. 'If we understand the Revelation literally,' remarks the latter, 'we must *judaize*.' What he means by taking it literally, he afterwards explains, by referring to 'the fable of a thousand years and the terrestrial Jerusalem.'† Mr. Vint has occupied a chapter with citations from Gill, Lightfoot, and other learned writers, describing some of the Jewish traditions relating to the seven millenniums. He then proceeds to shew 'the reception given to Jewish traditions, by the first professors of Christianity;' but no direct evidence on this point is of an earlier date than the second century. Passages are cited from the writings of Justin, Irenæus, Tertullian, and other early Millenarians, which are familiar to those who have entered into the controversy, but may be acceptable to readers who have not ready access to learned tomes and primary authorities. A learned writer, in a volume now on our table, has attempted to vindicate the character of Papias, the father of the judaizing Millenarians, by attributing to his gross and puerile representations a figurative meaning. 'It is quite evident,' he thinks, 'from Papias's expressions, as cited by Irenæus, that he did not intend to be understood literally; when, for instance, he says, that each vine shall have ten thousand branches, limbs, bunches, &c., &c., things quite out of nature, and which have no possible connexion with religion, unless taken figuratively; and the wonder is, how Eusebius could have forgot-

* See Eclectic Review, March, 1829. Vol. I., 3d. Series, p. 198.

† See Lardner's Works, Vol. II., p. 702.

‘ten himself so far as to think they had.’* Both Papias and Irenæus have been, it is contended, misunderstood. But they must have been misunderstood, not only by Eusebius, but by Dionysius, who is represented by Jerom as having written expressly, not against Cerinthus, but against the fables of Irenæus. The anxiety to attribute a spiritual meaning to their fables, is not new. A curious passage is cited by Mr. Vint from the writings of Brightman, an English clergyman of the sixteenth century, who wrote commentaries in Latin on the Canticles and the Apocalypse, (it is remarkable, that a particular fondness for the former book should almost uniformly have characterized the Millenarians,) and who dated the *commencement* of the thousand years from ‘the binding of the Devil by Constantine.’†

‘For this is the kingdom of Christ, when he ruleth in the midst of any people, and swayeth them with the sceptre of his word. And this is, indeed, the most true empire and kingdom of any nation, when it is subjected to Christ’s empire alone, and when it is governed by his conduct and command alone. Now, at length, we may perceive what kind of kingdom of a thousand years lasting, that is, whereof we are a part, thanks be given to God for it, touching which, all the ancient Fathers almost, as Papias, Irenæus, Justin, Tertullian, Lactantius, and Augustin also in some part, have spoken so many things and those so magnificently. Out of all doubt, they would have this kingdom to be spiritual, the infinite sweetness whereof, they shadowed out by corporal things after the manner of the Prophets. And yet I will not deny, that some of them inclined too much in their opinions to bodily delights; but was it that they might plunge themselves and gratify themselves in them, as men are wont to do that overwhelm themselves with riot and with being given to sensual pleasures? It cannot be that any such matter should ever come into the minds of such learned and holy men; but, because they knew that the church should also enjoy exceedingly great felicity pertaining to this life under this kingdom of Christ, therefore, they make mention of the abundance of this kind of delights. And indeed, we wait now every day till the Antichrist of Rome and the Turk shall be utterly destroyed. Till this victory be obtained, the Church shall be still in her warfaring estate, she must keep in tents, and has to wrestle with many adversities. But after this work shall be despatched, she shall have a most joyful triumph, as rejoicing exceedingly because of those unspeakable pleasures and delights which she shall afterwards live in perpetually.’ pp. 53, 54.

One ancient commentator on the Apocalypse (Andrew, bishop of Caesarea, about A. D. 500) interprets ch. xx. 1—3, of ‘the weakening of the power of the Devil by means of Our Lord’s

* Lee’s Sermons and Dissertations, p. 344.

† This was also the opinion of Grotius.

'death;' an opinion which has found a modern advocate in Professor Lee, although, strange to say, he makes the thousand years end with the apostolic age! Bishop Andrew discovers more sobriety of judgement: 'whether the thousand years 'spoken of denote exactly that term, or only a long duration,' he says, 'God only knows.' Afterwards on verse 7, he has the following remarks, which we cite from Lardner as being not wholly undeserving of attention.

'Some confine the above-mentioned thousand years to the 'short period of Our Lord's ministry, from his baptism to his 'ascension to heaven, being no more than three years or three 'years and a half. Others think that, after the completion of 'six thousand years, shall be the first resurrection from the 'dead, which is to be peculiar to the saints alone; who are to 'be raised up, that they may dwell again on this earth, where 'they had given proofs of patience and fortitude; and that they 'may live a thousand years in honour and plenty; after which 'will be the general resurrection of good and bad. But the 'Church receives neither of those interpretations; for we remember what our Lord said to the Sadducees, That the 'righteous shall be as "the angels which are in heaven;" as 'also the words of Paul, who says, "The kingdom of God is 'not meat and drink." By the thousand years, therefore, we 'understand, the time of the preaching of the Gospel (or the 'time of the Gospel dispensation).'*

Mr. Vint, if we understand him aright, seems to have adopted a similar conclusion. He complains of the translation of Rev. xx. 4. in the Authorized Version, as the worst that he has seen, and a violation of all grammatical construction. He considers the Vulgate translation as the best that has fallen under his notice, and renders it thus:

"And I saw thrones, and *some* sat upon them, and judgement was given to them; and *I saw* the souls of such as had been beheaded for the testimony of Jesus, and for the word of God, and *those persons* who worshipped not the beast nor his image, and who received not his mark on their foreheads and on their hands, and lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." p. 79.

Conformably to this view of the passage, he is of opinion, that 'the confinement of the dragon for a thousand years has terminated, or is about to terminate.' This alarming intimation, however, is accompanied with an avowal, that the Author 'believes with all the eagerness of desire and hope, that the glory 'and blessedness of the latter days are approaching, but un-

* Lardner's Works, Vol. V. p. 79.

‘ limited by any period of a thousand years, or of three hundred and sixty thousand years.’

We had intended to notice in the present article, some recent publications by the Rev. S. R. Maitland upon inquiries connected with ‘ the prophetic periods ’ of the Apocalypse, which, if not more satisfactory than the general mass of dissertation upon this boundless theme of discussion, merit the praise of learned ingenuity. But our readers are, we fear, already weary of being led through the mazes of opinion, without being conducted to any definite issue. The best possible issue, however, of such investigations, it seems to us, is that humility of mind which acquiesces in uncertainty, where evidence is unattainable, and knowledge is for the wisest reasons withheld. “ It is not for *us* to know the times or the seasons which the Father hath put in His own power.” Of this, however, we are assured : that “ the kingdom of God cometh not with observation ; neither shall they say, Lo, here ! or Lo, there ! for, behold, the kingdom of God is within you.” (Luke xviii. 20, 21.)

Art. IV. *An Inquiry concerning the Indications of Insanity*, with Suggestions for the better Protection and Care of the Insane. By John Conolly, M.D., Professor of Medicine in the University of London. 8vo. pp. 496. Price 12s. London, 1830.

THE Author of this “ Inquiry,” is a person of highly respectable talent and character, whose appointment as medical professor in the London University, was, we doubt not, awarded with as little of the spirit of a *job* as may consist with the decrees and determinations of any corporate body : and we have been given to understand, that his conduct in the professorial chair fully justifies the election of the council. If, indeed, Dr. Conolly lectures as he writes, his manner must be exceedingly well calculated to make that favourable impression on his pupils, which, so far as it goes, is of much avail towards insuring an attentive auditory. A treatise on Insanity from an individual placed in so honourable and responsible a station, cannot fail of exciting higher expectations, and of being subjected to a severer scrutiny, than one from an unknown or obscure writer ; more especially when an announcement is made, largely by implication, and well nigh in absolute terms, that, in the pages put forth are to be found originality in theory, and improvement in practice, to the extent of not merely justifying, but actually rendering necessary their prompt publication.

We have attentively perused Dr. C.’s work, and must say that we have been charmed with the liveliness of its style, and with the Writer’s aptitude for illustration. The impression that

it has left, is, that the work, as a whole, indicates much cleverness, and not a little vanity; vanity, we say, inasmuch as our duty imposes a plainness of terms, and because we consider that Dr. Conolly has both much overrated his own powers, and much undervalued those of his predecessors and contemporaries, by imagining himself to have thrown any new light either on the nature of the mind, or on the phenomena of its disordered condition.

The often iterated question, What is Insanity? received a reply, some thirty years ago, from an acute metaphysician, who has since distinguished himself by his Lectures on Moral Philosophy, and his criticisms, more especially, on the doctrines of Stewart and Reid. Dr. Darwin, in his "*Zoonomia*," had defined the essence of insanity to be an excess of volition. In his strictures on that work, Dr. Brown, objecting to this hypothesis, assumes that the state in question is constituted by a peculiar vividness in the ideas of imagination; and he proceeds to 'examine whether this be sufficient to explain all the phenomena of deranged intellect; for if it be sufficient, it is unphilosophical to suppose another cause of difference from the 'sane condition.' We are here tempted to transcribe the fine paragraph by which this Author introduces his strictures on Darwin; not that the remarks have any particular bearing on the points under discussion, but as they furnish an admirable example of that manly tone and good taste, that 'seriousness in a serious cause,' and abstinence from meretricious graces of diction, which some of our flashy writers would do well to imitate.

'Of the various spectacles of misery', says Dr. Brown, 'which the great drama of life continually presents, that of madness excites the most painful combination of feelings. We regret the death of a man of genius, because we believe that the mind which delighted and instructed us, has survived the mouldering body, and is still in possession of all its former energies. But, in madness, it is the decay of the mind itself which we view. The large projects of benevolence and genius have subsided. He whose former years were wholly employed in relieving misery, now seems to take pleasure in the little tricks of malice; the tongue to which we have listened with rapture, while every word removed a prejudice, or unfolded a truth, now utters only incoherent ravings; the hand which "waked to extacy the living lyre", is earnestly employed in the most trifling sports of the infant; and that mind which pierced the secret recesses of nature, and traced the laws by which our ideas succeed, now seems sunk in listless indolence. The past rushes on our memory; we compare it with the present; and he who has walked without anguish

‘amid the ruins of an empire, finds it difficult to sustain the sight of intellect in decay.’

In subsequently illustrating his theory of Insanity, Dr. Brown remarks:—‘Vividness in the ideas of imagination, leads us to refer them to external objects; checks the usual course of association; occasions us to form erroneous judgements, and thus to perform actions which appear irrational to those who compare only ideas of perception. The madman swears, talks obscenely, and pays no regard to cleanliness in his person and actions, because the associate idea of impropriety is not induced. He thinks that he has performed certain actions, or that certain events will necessarily happen, because he does not remember the ideas with which these are inconsistent. In the midst of wealth, he pines with the thoughts of dying in indigence; and surrounded with all the endearments of friendship and of domestic tenderness, he believes himself abandoned by the world. He discerns malignity in an eye which beams only with love and compassion; every heart disowns him, and every expression of regard is only meant to deceive.’

‘When the system is in a sound state, we rectify our erroneous judgement by *comparing* them with other ideas. In the mind of the insane person, these ideas are not excited, and his judgements, therefore, are permanently erroneous. He disregards perception, and, confined in a small apartment, fancies himself sovereign of the universe; or he combines imagination with perception, and believes himself a captive prince.’

The whole case is, in fact, reducible to the relative weakness of perception, and the relative strength of conception. We employ the term relative, because conception or imagination, or call it by whatever name you please, may mount up far above its ordinary standard, while the individual still continues sane. The conceptions of the poet may take a wide range and lofty flights, without inducing any approach to madness. And why? Because the man of kindled imagination, if his judgement remains unimpaired, knows that he is imagining; or, in other words, voluntarily transports himself into an ideal world, and in that world revels and luxuriates, only so long as may consist with a power to retain correct perceptions, or return to healthy associations. His mind is furnished with balance as well as spring. He carries into dangerous regions ballast proportioned to his wide-spread canvass; and the moment that these due adjustments are interfered with, is the moment of peril that the intellect is about to suffer those commotions which may ultimately make shipwreck of the understanding.

This view of the subject, by the way, may serve to expose

the vulgar error, which places wit or genius in an approximating relation to insanity. It is *deficiency*, and not exuberance of mental power, which conducts to madness. One faculty is heightened at the expense of another's depression and irregularity; and derangement is the result.

'Madness', again to cite Dr. Brown, 'is a disease of the *motives* alone. That is, we are not then excited by the real appearance of things, but by the more vivid ideas of imagination.' Before we proceed to collate this principle and its exposition with the statements of Dr. Conolly, as to the essentials of a disordered, in opposition to a healthy condition of the intellect, we must again advert to the exposition given by the able opponent of Darwin, who, in the paragraph just placed before the reader, plainly states the loss of the *comparing* power to be the main deficiency by which madness is formed. Yet, notwithstanding the distinct announcement of this opinion more than half a century ago, our Professor brings forward, as an original discovery, this same definition or account of the insane condition; which he represents as the detection of an important principle, equally important, in the illustration of the phenomena of mental disease, and, before the appearance of his book, equally hidden, as the latent heat or fixed air of Dr. Black, in respect to chemical philosophy. Whole sections of our Author's treatise are devoted to the complacent exposition of his supposed discovery, that a madman has lost the correctness of his comparing power, and is therefore not able to judge and act as he ought to do. Indeed, the words comparing and impairment occur so frequently in the pages of Dr. Conolly, that the reader becomes actually nauseated by their introduction. 'Insanity', says Dr. C., 'is the impairment of any one or more of the faculties of the mind, accompanied with or inducing a defect in the comparing faculty.'

' "Who thus define it, say they more or less
Than this, that happiness is happiness!" '

We have been better pleased with that division of the present treatise, in which Dr. C. opposes those minute divisions of the disorder, and those subtile distinctions between madness and sanity, with which the works of mere nosographers abound. Mental disorder and mental health differ, according to the present Writer, in degree, more than in kind; and an interesting section of his book is devoted to the consideration of those states which, without being medically considered as madness, are, in a manner, intermediate between actual sanity and positive disorder. It behooves the professors of the healing art, especially to observe and recognize these shades and gradations, inasmuch as both decision on the question of sound intellect,

and a nice adaptation of means to prevent the establishment of absolute derangement, may be furnished by such recognition. We are happy to find that the opinion is daily gaining ground, that insanity is not so definitively separated from mental and bodily health and disease, as was formerly thought. This conviction seems to us to harmonize both with philosophy and with observation; and the adoption of the principles arising out of this conviction, is calculated to lessen the horror connected with the contemplation of madness in all its dread varieties. By this means, the pathology and treatment of intellectual disorder are likely to be placed on a better footing, and to conduct to a more successful result. In his sentiments on this head, however, Dr. C. cannot claim to be listened to in the character of a discoverer, whatever ingenuity he may have shewn in his positions, or however felicitous his illustrations. 'Every nervous disease', remarks an antithetical and somewhat quaint writer, 'is a *degree* of insanity.' 'Madness', says another writer of distinguished talent, 'means every thing, and means nothing.' In a small tract on Nervous Disorder recently noticed in our pages *, the recognition of this non-specific character of mental unsoundness is strongly insisted on, as necessary to a correct appreciation of all derangement in the class *nervosis* of nosological authors. The good sense of mankind is gradually coming into accordance with this more philosophical and more salutary view of morbid affections of mind, or rather of body and mind, than has hitherto generally obtained.

Dr. Conolly, without being apparently a decided phrenologist, speaks favourably of the recent attempts to *locate* faculty, which those physiologists have attempted, who assume for their science the name of phrenology;—a name, by the way, which seems to assume the existence of the science as the only true exposition of mental phenomena that has been broached. Be this as it may, we have no wish to deny, that some of the positions and inferences advanced and maintained by the phrenological school, coincide with fact. Perception, memory, &c., are, for the most part, treated by the metaphysicians as distinct human faculties; and based on the assumption of these primary powers, a fabric of philosophy has been erected, consistent, as it has been imagined, with what is traceable by common observation. Yet, we are surely taught by the workings of our own mind, and by observing, so far as is possible, the peculiarities of others, that one individual recollects with facility one thing, which another finds it hard to retain; while this second person has an advantage over the first, in reference to other

* See Eclect. Rev. Vol. III. (3d series) p. 560.

circumstances which become the subjects of recognition. All this may, it is alleged, be the result of accidental impressions, directing the faculties into this or that course. If, however, the phrenologist could, by induction from sufficient facts, make good his conclusions, the remarkable discrepancies to which we now allude, would certainly be more easily accounted for upon his system, than upon the other. It is a singular fact, that the Author whose description of insanity we cited at the commencement of the present article, differs from his predecessors in the same degree that he approaches the phrenologists, and this without any reference to the creed of Gall. Indeed, he argues and reasons as if no such creed had ever cost him a moment's thought; and we have reason to believe, that he classed the thing altogether with the visionary sciences and false pretensions of physiognomy and astrology.

It is easy to say, that deficient attention is the source of defective memory; and that, for want of the memory's being in due and proportioned exercise with the other faculties, deviations from the standard of mental health,—in other words, the different degrees and kinds of insanity originate. It is, indeed, of the greatest importance for individuals to gain and preserve, as much as in them lies, an habitual command over the faculty of attention, and a consequent integrity of general recollection, if they wish to guard against the possible inroads of madness. But it cannot be questioned, (whatever system we adopt in order to explain the fact,) that assiduous attention to, and a subsequent mastery of one subject of pursuit, may consist with an incapacity to attend to and master another, to a surprising extent. Nor do we see how the vast varieties manifested in positive insanity,—the extreme cleverness and skill of the madman in some things, combined with an almost idiotic obtuseness in others, can be made to square with the generally received theory respecting the intellectual powers of perception, attention, memory, and judgement. Indeed, if we are thus to simplify and class faculties, we should find our paths through the mazes of mind and the wanderings of mania, rendered more easy, by adopting a theory which we have lately met with in a Medico-Metaphysical Lecture of Mr. Greville Jones, who maintains, that every mental phenomenon is susceptible of solution, by assuming that all the elements of the mind are resolvable into impressions present to the senses, conceptions which are the recollection of impressions, and the union of these two, by which union are constituted pure abstractions. Association and imagination are, in this theory of Mr. Jones, supposed to be consequences resulting from the relative bearings which impressions have with conceptions, according to the varied conditions, natural and induced, of mind and body.

The most striking deficiency, perhaps, in Dr. Conolly's treatise, relates to that part of the subject which comes under the head of pathology; for after all, abstracts of Locke's *Philosophy of the Human Mind*, and ingenious subtilties as to the cause, and modes, and principles of intellectual circumstance, bear much less directly upon the prevention and cure of madness, than investigations of connecting bodily states. In the short lecture to which we have just adverted, this connection is treated of, so far as the Lecturer goes, in an interesting manner. 'One great difference', remarks Mr. Jones, 'in the activity and power of the mind, will be found to be according as the brain is fully or scantily supplied with blood, and according as that blood is well aerated. Thus we find that, where the cortical or sanguineous part of the brain predominates so as to afford an extensive surface, the activity of the mind is greater; and so essential is the quality of the blood, that if the action of the lungs stops a moment, the brain's action ceases at once.'*

* That Mr. Jones is no disciple of the new doctrines alluded to in the text, the following citation will fully prove, which we throw into a note, as the subject has no immediate connexion with the matter of the text.

'Man has a more convoluted and capacious cerebrum than any other animal that approaches him nearly; and his memory is more extensive, and his associations more numerous. Observe, however, that there are no parts of consequence in the human brain, other than are found in beasts, although he (man) possesses faculties of which they (animals) have no trace. Man is not superior to animals in degree. He is quite different from them. There is a gradual link in the creation up to the monkey. From him to man, the break is abrupt. To turn round, as it were, on himself; to say, "thus do I think, and thus will;" to ask "what am I, and whence?" to dive into the future and the past; to be susceptible of the love of fame, and the miscalled bubble, "reputation"; to feel the poet's frenzy, the enthusiast's devotion;—these are attributes which could never have been produced by the associations which belong to brutes, however exalted those might become.

'When, then, we observe that, with all these mighty powers, there are no fresh cerebral parts, we shall be inclined to look with a deriding eye on those philosophers who attribute the superior qualities of man to a bump in this or that situation; and we shall scarcely feel less contempt for those who talk of genius, talent, and intellectual superiority, as if man were of many species—as if the *rational* faculties of men differed—as if there were any other causes of our different attainments except what belong to the goads to exertion, to our constitution, and our education. But I shall not dwell on this; for I despair of any converts at present to this opinion; the opposite is too flattering to vanity to be easily parted with.'

It is moreover of the highest importance that we should take into our account the condition of the stomach, of the liver, of the uterus, of the several secretories of the body, in conjunction with and relation to cerebral conditions, before we can have any clear conception as to the astonishing mutations of which the thinking principle is susceptible. These mutations are often effected in an exceedingly short space of time,—a man being irascible or *mad* at one moment, obviously from physical circumstances, and in the next, calm, composed, and *in his senses*. All these particulars ought to be traced and scrutinized in a work on disordered perception; and the difficulty which attends the investigation in many cases, ought to serve only to excite to a more close and thorough research.

A section of Dr. C.'s book is, indeed, devoted to the consideration of those 'various *stimuli* by which intellectual power 'and activity are modified.' In this division of the treatise, we meet with some excellent hints in reference to the management of the mind, and to those conditions of it out of which insanity is easily engendered. The following extract is rather long, but we should be doing injustice to our Author by omitting or even abridging it.

'There is also an excitement of the mind, which arises from its own action; but when it is produced, the attention, and comparison, and memory, cannot always be exercised without borrowing so much aid from the imagination, as to shew the latter faculty its importance, and to produce the danger of its encroachment; and thus, men who are anxious to excel in serious labours, are not unfrequently led away from them to imaginative creations. The most lively of the faculties will not always condescend to play the part of an auxiliary, to guide and animate the mental labour, and decorate the solid fabric raised by the judgement; but allures away the attention from occupations which fatigue it, to more pleasureable exercise, from which, although it may sometimes return refreshed, it cannot always be reclaimed. I am inclined to believe, that many of the shorter kinds of poetical performances, and several of the most unbidden, but acknowledged felicities of harmonious composition, have intruded themselves upon their authors' minds in the midst of their most serious occupations, bounding in among their graver thoughts like the dancers in a serious pantomime, and after usurping the stage for a time, allowing the graver plot to proceed. When the mental faculties are excited to any kind of exercise, a disposition may be raised in them to other kinds of exercise; and their exertions and powers may prove to be greater than the individual possessing them knew himself to be endowed with. It is exercise which discloses the uncounted and unknown treasures of the memory, and produces from the imagination, combinations of such force and variety, as to justify our calling them creations.

'The influence of the mind's exercise upon the mind itself, is commonly then of a beneficial kind. A belief, however, is entertained by

some, and industriously propagated by others who can hardly be supposed to entertain it, that the mind is generally hindered by its own exercise, and that education, as applied to the middle and lower ranks, is therefore hurtful to the understanding, and even productive of madness. Why these effects should be limited to rank, and not be the universal consequences of education, they do not explain. It would not be more unreasonable to assert, that the exercise of the body is necessarily productive of disease and deformity. Education is the training and exercise of the mind; and, as when we recommend bodily exercise, we do not mean the unnatural postures of the ballet, or the violent exertions of the gymnasium, neither do we mean an intemperate straining of the mental faculties. To educate a man, in the full and proper sense of the word, is to supply him with the power of controlling his feelings, and his thoughts, and his actions; between doing which and becoming insane, or unable to control his feelings, his thoughts, and his actions, there is no very visible connexion. The best way of deciding the matter is, by an appeal to facts. Whoever will converse with lunatics with a view to its elucidation, will soon be satisfied, that a very small proportion of them consists of those whose talents have been regularly and judiciously cultivated. If I may trust to my own observation, I should say, that a well-educated man or woman is generally an exception to the rest; and that the majority is made up of weak and ignorant persons; even those who seem to have acquired some little knowledge, being commonly those who have picked it up as they could, with many disadvantages, and without the method which what alone deserves the name of a good education, would have imparted to their application. The registers of the *Bicêtre* for a series of years, shew that even when madness affects those who belong to the educated classes, it is chiefly seen in those whose education has been imperfect or irregular; and very rarely indeed in those whose minds have been fully, equally, and systematically exercised. Priests, artists, painters, sculptors, poets, and musicians, whose professions so often appear marked in that register, are often persons of very limited or exclusive education; their faculties have been unequally exercised; they have commonly given themselves up too much to imagination, and have neglected comparison, and have not habitually exercised the judgement. Even of this class, it is to be remembered, that it is commonly those of the lowest order of the class, in point of talent, who become thus affected; whilst of naturalists, physicians, chemists, geometricians, it is said, not one instance occurs in these registers. Every one's recollection will convince him, that of those attaining to eminence in any of the departments even of a more imaginative character, nothing is so rare as for any one to exhibit symptoms of insanity.

We have already intimated our opinion, that irregularity, rather than exuberance, is the constituent element of madness; and we are glad to find the present Author ably maintaining the same *postulatum*. It is of importance, that absent, eccentric individuals may not run away with the notion, that superiority

to others is manifested by a disposition to deviate from ordinary and accustomed modes of feeling and conduct. Dr. Haslam has maintained a similar opinion. 'I am at a loss,' he says, 'to understand, how deficiency can be construed into power, defect into superiority. If a man talk and act irrationally, there is surely to be argued, a want, rather than an exuberance of faculty.'

It has been stated, that Dr. Conolly has omitted to consider the *rationale* of the insane state as connected with physical condition and circumstances. He would, perhaps, refer us to the contents of his seventh chapter, in disproof of the allegation; but we must say, that we have been able to deduce no further information from the whole of it, than this, that the *corpus sanum* is necessary for the *mens sana*. Of the same sort of truisms, the section immediately succeeding is chiefly made up. Surely, neither medical readers nor unprofessional inquirers require to be told, that disordered condition is regulated or modified by age, or that some intellects are more, some less, precocious than the average standard. The ninth chapter is entitled, as if *par excellence*, "Insanity;" and here we have histories and definitions, and objections to definitions, and amusing, if not instructive, anecdotes; but it all ends in this, that madness, in all its modifications, consists in an '*impairment of the comparing faculty*,' or what others have, with at least equal propriety, termed a state in which the due balance is destroyed between perception and conception. 'The madman is not capable of rectifying his erroneous judgements, by *comparing* them with other ideas. In his mind, indeed, these are not excited, and his judgements are therefore permanently erroneous. He disregards perception, and, confined in a small apartment, fancies himself sovereign of the universe; or he combines imagination with perception, and believes himself a captive prince.' Can any statement be more correct than the above? Is not the accuracy of it confirmed by the every days' observation of those individuals who officially visit asylums for lunatics? Surely, there was no necessity for attempting to establish it by expanding the argument over the compass of 500 pages.

Several passages, however, might be extracted from this part of Dr. C.'s volume, which would prove the Author to be possessed of no mean abilities; and he has thrown a graphic force and interest into some of his remarks and illustrations, which almost cheats us into the belief that originality of thought and information are combined with a lively and fascinating style. We select the following passage, not because it is the best in the chapter, but because it contains an allusion to the system of Gall and Spurzheim, as the one which, if true, best

harmonizes with those inconsistencies that are so extremely puzzling when we attempt to account for them by any of the received doctrines of mental pathology.

‘ It is only by the supposition of the comparing power being lost, that we are at all enabled to explain a phenomenon which can in no other way be accounted for ; viz. that presented by a man labouring under an insane delusion, and yet entertaining a belief entirely opposite to it, and what is incompatible with the delusion ; cherishing two opposite sentiments, in fact, or two opposite convictions at the same time. I have heard a man in this state say, that he was the most miserable of human beings, but that he had every thing about him to make him happy ; or lament that he had lost all affection for his wife, or nearest connexions, whom, however, he would thus allude to with tears in his eyes, and in affectionate language. Others accuse themselves of having led a deplorably wicked life, and in the same breath protest that they have never done harm to any body living ; or they will lament the disordered state of their own minds, and yet accuse themselves of not wishing to have the disorder removed ; or they will address those about them in harsh and cruel terms, and weep because they feel that they do so. A lunatic will sometimes say, that he knows he is very ill, but that it is very strange he cannot persuade himself to believe it ; and he will perhaps end the sentence by declaring that he is not ill at all. Truth and delusion seem, under such circumstances, to be contending for the mastery ; but the strongest ally of truth, the power of making just comparisons, has deserted her standard, and unless her forces can be rallied, delusion finally gains the victory. That which is false, is believed, not because, in these instances, that which is true is forgotten, for that which is true is believed also ; but the comparison which would shew that both could not be true at the same time, and that one of two opposite things believed was untrue, cannot be exercised. In this intellectual disorder, lunatics have committed atrocious crimes, feeling remorse even whilst committing them ; and others, fearing death from poison or from natural causes, have committed suicide* ; whilst some, like the idiot mentioned by Dr. Gall, have delighted in setting fire to houses, and have been seen to be equally glad to extinguish the fire when lighted.

‘ Assuredly, it is no inconsiderable fact, in support of the opinion of the propensities being located in different portions of the nervous substance, that we find individuals, not remarkable for inhumanity, seized with a sudden desire to murder and destroy. If, in some instances, we can explain the propensity by the supposition of a morbid impression of a nature to excite revenge, we see other instances in which it is indulged without any such object ; and men and women have cruelly murdered their relatives, or even their own children, ap-

* ‘ They rush into the arms of death’, says Dr. Reid very poetically, if not very philosophically, ‘ as if to avoid the terrors of his countenance.’

parently impelled to such frightful crimes by a physical excitement which was not extended to other propensities. The excitement is so strong as to exclude every opposing emotion, and to prevent the exercise of either the attention or memory; and no comparison is made; the whole man is dominated by one morbid feeling. The degree to which this feeling admits of resistance, is often a very important question, inasmuch as it affects the responsibility of such individuals for the crimes they commit. It appears, in some cases, to be as little within the control of the patient, as the muscular movements are in a fit of hysteria or epilepsy. In one case, a *part* of the nervous system is irritated, and the effect is irregular and violent action in the organs receiving supplies of nervous stimulus from that part. I do not see how the same explanation can well be withheld from the other case. If it is extended to it, we must also admit, that, as remote mischief or irritation, the presence of irritating secretions, of undigested food, or even of worms in the intestinal canal, may cause a nervous irritation of which the result is an epileptic paroxysm. Analogous causes of disorder may sometimes temporarily modify the intellectual and moral manifestations of the individual, add to the force of sensations and emotions, impair the power of the controlling judgement, and misdirect the will.

In the whole compass of the subject of Insanity or deranged mental functions, there is nothing of more difficult exposition, or requiring, on all accounts, more careful investigation, than these momentary contrarieties. We shall on a future occasion advert more specifically to this very interesting and important topic. At present, we merely throw out the remark, that it will not appear very obvious to most persons, how Gall's system of pneumatology can be considered as explaining the irregularities alluded to more easily or satisfactorily than some other theories. At all events, it must be allowed, that that ingenious physiologist had in some measure been anticipated in his observations on parts of the brain being subject to excitation, while other portions remain comparatively at rest, and on this *location* of excitability, with all its varied consequences and accompaniments, constituting the essence of madness. Dr. Cullen, whom it is perhaps in the present day too fashionable to deride, employs expressions, in his *Theory of Delirious Wanderings*, precisely to the same point. 'In order', he remarks, 'to the proper exercise of our intellectual functions, the excitement must be complete and equal in *every part of the brain*. For, though we cannot say that the vestiges of ideas are laid up in different parts of the brain, or that they are in some measure diffused over the whole, it will follow, upon either supposition, that our intellectual operations always require the orderly and exact recollection or memory of associated ideas; so that, if *any part of the brain* is not excited, or not excitable, that

‘recollection cannot properly take place, while at the same time other parts of the brain, more excited and excitable, may give false perceptions, associations, and judgements.’

Again, when alluding to the appearances of the brain after the death of lunatics, and its reported various conditions, Dr. Cullen says: ‘Whether these different states have been observed to be uniformly the same over the *whole* of the brain, I cannot certainly learn; and I suspect the dissectors have not always accurately inquired into this circumstance. But in several instances, it appears, that these states have been different in different parts of the brain; and *instances of this inequality will afford a confirmation of our general doctrine.*’

It would be interesting to enlarge on these curious points of mental pathology, but we must hasten briefly to notice those topics which are discussed in the last division of Dr. Conolly’s Treatise. In this part of his work, the Author manifests both benevolent feeling and ability; but his schemes for the detection and management of insanity, will, we are disposed to think, be much modified and moderated by a more intimate and practical acquaintance with the peculiarities of madness. We agree with him, that the whole duty of a medical man, when summoned to decide the question of lunacy, or the expediency of restraint, is ‘resolvable into two parts:—

- ‘1. To determine whether the individual in question be of sound mind.
- ‘2. To give an opinion concerning the treatment required, and especially concerning the necessity of restraint, *and the degree and nature of the restraint.*’

We must, however, decline to follow our Author through that part of his work in which these heads are enlarged on; as it would occupy more time and space than we can conveniently spare at present, to go into the several particulars which they comprehend; and we shall have occasion, at no distant period, to resume the topic which has been the subject of the present article. We may then take an opportunity again to advert to our Author’s performance, for the purpose of collating his observations with those of others; and it will be for Dr. C. then to say, whether our power of ‘comparing’ has been ‘impaired,’ either by prejudice or by disorder. For the present, we must take leave of him with thanking him for the entertainment that his treatise has afforded us, and with recommending him, at the same time, to revise his schemes and suggestions for detecting insanity, and for classifying the insane. Let him ask himself,—‘Have I not here strayed into the Utopian land of theory and speculation, from which I should be recalled by experience,

were practice of a more extended kind and specific character, to become the test of my lofty lucubrations ?'

Art. V. *A Concise View of the Succession of Sacred Literature*, in a Chronological Arrangement of Authors and their Works, from the Invention of Alphabetical Characters, to the Year of our Lord 1445. Vol. I. Part I. By Adam Clarke, LL.D., F.A.S., &c. Part II. by J. B. B. Clarke, M.A. 8vo. pp. 502. Price 12s. 1830.

TO many of our readers, the 'Concise View,' which was originally published in a 12mo volume, in 1807, must be well known. Of the utility of such a work, no reasonable doubt could be entertained. It appears, however, to have been much less patronised than could have been expected. We should not have surmised, that nearly a quarter of a century would have passed away without the circulation of many more copies than were included in the first edition. Such a circumstance may possibly be one of the indications by which the character of our own times is to be estimated. In its new form, the work may, perhaps, be more fortunate, and its circulation better answer to the wishes of the united Authors, and reflect more credit upon the religious part of the community.

The design of the 'Concise View' is, to trace from the first portion of the sacred writings, the successive communications, to the completion of the Hebrew canon, including notices of the principal Jewish writers who refer to and explain the books which it comprises; and to describe in like manner, the books of the New Testament, and the works of Christian authors who may be adduced as witnesses to their prior existence, up to the period of the invention of printing. A chain of evidence is thus formed, the links of which connect the earliest of all known writings, the Mosaic records, with the Biblical comments of the Christian expositors who witnessed the application of the beautiful and perfect art by which literary productions may be multiplied most extensively, to the preservation and enlarged diffusion of the Scriptures. In executing the latter part of his design, Dr. Clarke presents a view of ecclesiastical antiquity, containing a regular enumeration of the apostolical and primitive Fathers, and the succeeding writers of the Church, an account of their lives, and an analysis of their productions. The merits of the present publication are to be estimated by this part of it; and the variety of subjects which it comprises, and the able and skilful manner in which they are arranged and displayed, cannot fail of receiving the approbation of every intelligent and liberal critic. We should, perhaps, not be disposed to go so far with Dr. Clarke, as to maintain any necessary relation between the solid

attainments of Christian divines, in their vocation as ministers of religion, and the study of ecclesiastical antiquities not included in the New Testament; but we entirely concur with him in respect to the advantages which are to be derived from an intimate acquaintance with them; and add, with great pleasure, that we know not in what manner we could render a more valuable service to the student who is directing his attention to this branch of knowledge, than to recommend him to avail himself of the guidance which the interesting volume before us supplies.

The former volume concludes with a notice of Julius Firmicus Maternus, A.D. 345. In the one before us, the last article of the first part, which terminates the series by Dr. Clarke, is 'Basil, Bishop of Cæsarea, A.D. 370.' Notices of Cyril of Jerusalem, Hilary of Poitiers, and Epiphanius, are the principal of the additions introduced by the Author of this part, who has enlarged the former notices of Cyprian and Methodius, and in other respects much improved the work.

Part the second, by the Rev. J. B. B. Clarke, commences with the '*divine*' Gregory of Nazianzum, A.D. 370, and concludes with Mark the Hermit, A.D. 395. The principal authors described within this period are, Gregory Nazianzen, Ephraem Syrus, Gregory of Nyssa, Ambrose, and Jerom. No one who examines these articles, can doubt of the qualifications of the Continuator to complete his Father's design, 'with credit to himself, and profit to the reader;' and we shall be glad to receive the sequel of the work, executed in the manner we are authorized to expect from the specimens now before us.

In his account of the Council of Nice, A.D. 325, Dr. Clarke asks, how such expressions as the assembled ecclesiastics inserted in the creed named after their place of meeting, can be admitted, and the *eternity* of Christ's Divine nature be credited. The particular expressions to which he thus refers, are the phrases—'*Begotten of the Father before all worlds—begotten, not made.*' 'A genuine Trinitarian, who believes the *infinite* and *eternal Godhead* of Christ, and who properly considers 'the import of the terms made use of by the Council,' could not, he thinks, subscribe the creed, 'either for peace or conscience sake.' This is an opinion which bears hard against the ministers of the Church of England, and, among them, on the Continuator, who has subscribed this denounced creed. Subscribing creeds, and declaring an unfeigned belief of their contents, is a most perilous proceeding. It is most strange and most offensive to reflect on the adoption of a set of expressions put together by some three hundred fallible, wrangling bishops, fifteen hundred years ago, as a standard of doctrine for tens of thousands of ministers, and to compare the tenets which many

of these are known to have asserted, with the terms of the Creed itself. What have men who live in these times to do with the Nicene ecclesiastics or their opinions? And what has the worship of Christians to do with the Nicene Creed or the Athanasian? But there they stand in the Book of Common Prayer; and the 'Priest' who ministers at the altar of the National Church, has solemnly declared that he believes all and every thing which they comprise. Arius was a heretic, and subscribed, it is said, the Nicene creed; and so, in Dr. Clarke's opinion, every abettor of Arianism might. The Council would therefore seem to have done their business in a very bungling manner*. But, in fabricating a yoke of bondage for the conscience, they were at least successful; and whether the terms of the creed be properly considered or not, by genuine Trinitarians, the fact is undeniable, that thousands of them make no scruple to declare that they fully believe every one of its articles.

We have been so much gratified with a paragraph which closes Dr. Clarke's account of Epiphanius's Treatise on the ancient Heresies; and it is so honourable a testimony to the discriminating faculty of the Author, and so entirely in accordance with our own sense of the wrongs which have been inflicted on men of whom only a correct knowledge is wanted, in order that their true excellence might be appreciated; that we shall lay it before our readers, accompanying it with the request that they will use their reflections upon its contents.

' This book of Epiphanius is not at present in high estimation, as it is well known to abound with errors and misrepresentations. I have no doubt, many of those termed *Heretics*, were genuine orthodox Christians, whose reputation was blackened by those who were *supreme in power*, and thought themselves in consequence, *infallible in judgement*. In every age, the enemy of God and man, endeavoured to sow tares among the wheat; and when he could not adulterate the truth, he corrupted the morals of those who professed it. Hence, a laxity of discipline, induced or followed by earthly-mindedness and conformity to the customs and manners of the world, deluged and disgraced the Church. But in all those times of error, seduction, and profligacy, there were not wanting men of clean hands and pure hearts, who rose up, and bore a faithful testimony against such as held the truth in unrighteousness, boasting of an *orthodox creed*, while their practices were Antichristian and impure. These faithful witnesses were often termed *Heretics* by the reigning party; and by proscriptions or persecutions, were either driven into exile, or obliged to separate from the Church. We know how easy it is to brand those with the name of *Heretics*, who separate from a church too profligate in its manners, and too corrupt in its doctrines, even to deserve the name of *Christian*; but, be-

* If it was not, indeed, intended at the time as an *irenicum*.

cause it has the secular power on its side, is authorized to do to the genuine followers of God, whatever it pleases. Is not the whole system of PROTESTANTISM a *Heresy*, in the decrees of the Romish church; and as *Heretics*, have they (Protestants) not been proscribed, banished, and burnt alive? Have they not had in the writings of their adversaries the most absurd doctrines laid to their charge, which they never held and never believed? Let the Protestant Reader think of these things; and then enquire how much credit he should attach to the accounts he reads of *ancient Heretics*, whether in *Irenæus*, *Tertullian*, *Epiphanius*, *Philaster*, or others, where the writings of the accused do not remain to speak for themselves. *Montanus*, *Tertullian*, and *Tatian*, were called *Heretics*;—much of their writings remains: but, who can prove them to be *Heretics*, from those writings?

The application of these sentiments requires to be very widely made. Secular Protestantism is deeply stained with the guilt of this species of injustice and cruelty. Opprobrious terms have been unsparingly employed to designate parties and persons, whose convictions or scruples prevented their doing homage as religious vassals to the reigning powers; and burning alive has been added to the denunciations, and proscriptions, and banishments, with which lay and clerical Protestant rulers have visited the humble and pious objects of their dislike and hatred. Heresy is a term from which nothing is to be learned in respect to truth or error; but we are generally right in interpreting it as a designation of the principles of the few and the weak, against the many and the powerful. It is heresy, to refuse assent to prevailing opinions, and to decline compliance with established customs. *ÆRIUS*, who lived in the latter part of the fourth century, is set down by *Epiphanius* as a heretic; and there have been many readers of *Ecclesiastical History*, who, on his authority, would deny to *ÆRIUS* a place among true Christians. He objected to the celebration of Easter; and when we advert to very modern instances of the importance which has been attached to its observance, we need scarcely express our surprise that the objection was heretical in the eyes of the Bishop of Salamis. *ÆRIUS* denounced praying for the dead as an unwarrantable and unavailing practice;—it was, however, a growing superstition of the age, and *Epiphanius* was with the multitude. But the capital error of *ÆRIUS* was, his maintaining that bishops and presbyters are not to be distinguished from each other, being of equal authority and station, and in all respects only names of the same office. To *Epiphanius*, this was an unpardonable offence against truth; and either in his charity or his zeal, he classes *ÆRIUS* with the senseless; only *madmen* being, in his view of the matter, capable of asserting such an opinion. *Ex uno disce omnes*. As it was in the beginning, so it has continued to be. The *ÆRIUSES* of their times, in opposing the errors and superstitions countenanced by princes, and churches, and bishops,

were sure to offer some aggravated scandal to the patrons of the assumed orthodox creeds; and it was quite easy for the venerated dignitaries who raised the outcry against them, to obtain credence for the worst reports which they chose to make of their tenets and their practice. Hence, the calumnies which have been accumulated on the memories of not a few of the benefactors of their kind; and hence, too, the false estimates to which others, who impeded their exertions and obscured their fame, owe their elevation. Epiphanius obtained the honours of canonization. From the Second part of the "Concise View," we may support the truth of these remarks, by the evidence of the following article in the analysis of Jerom's works.

'*Treatise against Vigilantius*,—who was regarded and treated as a heretic for maintaining the following doctrines:—that it was wrong to pray for the dead;—it was idolatry to venerate relics;—it was useless the making pilgrimages;—it was much more prudent to distribute in charity the interest, than at once sell the principal for the poor;—monasteries were injurious, and fasts useless;—saints do not intercede;—and arguments are used against the pretended miracles at the shrines of saints: all these things St. Jerom defends, and intersperses his answer to these *heresies* of Vigilantius with abusive terms and *ruffianly* language. Vigilantius endeavours to stem the tide of corruption; Jerom drives forward the flood: *this*, with the dogmatizing pride of his church, overbears his adversary; *that* had fallen upon evil times, and was subjected to all the calumnies invariably heaped upon those who strove to bring back the professors of Christianity to the purity of discipline and doctrine which distinguished the Apostolic age. The intemperance of style, and grossness of language, in this short treatise, disgraces a Christian, and should shame even a heathen.'

We should be glad to copy an entire article from the second part of this interesting Volume, but more space than we can afford would be requisite for such notice of any one of the principal writers comprised in the Author's descriptions, as would be a fair specimen of the work. We shall, however, extract a passage or two, to shew how well qualified the Continuator, to whom the completion of the design has been entrusted, is to carry it forward.

'Gregory Nazianzen is allowed, by the most competent judges, to have borne away the palm of eloquence from all the writers of his time, for purity of diction, sublimity of expression, elegance of style, variety of metaphor, and propriety and correctness of his comparisons. His eloquence has been so greatly respected, that he has been denominated the Christian *Isocrates*: and his deep theological knowledge acquired him the surname of the Divine. St. Jerom, who was well acquainted with him, styles him *Vir eloquentissimus*—a most eloquent man; calls him his preceptor, and intimates that he had been a frequent attendant on his ministry—*à quo scripturas explanante didici.*' p. 362.

—'It is a mournful thing to see such errors as,—supplicating the

Virgin, and praying to Saints, in the creed and practice of a man like Gregory, whose influence was so great as to spread his example, whose learning was so extensive as to give a sanction to others' credulity; and whose powers of language, and reach of thought, served the more effectually to gloss and recommend errors an unbridled imagination had conceived. The recurrence of prayers to saints and martyrs, is too frequent to be accounted for by the momentary excitement of his feelings, and too long and earnest to make doubt possible, whether the addresses sprang from a firm belief in a thoroughly digested creed: he calls saints to assist, and represents them as assisting; and every Reader must feel, that the invocations possess more of the heart than the imagination; that they are not mere *prosopopœias*, &c., but that belief speaks in the glow of eloquence. Even those who are inclined to treat him on this point the most leniently, must confess that, whatever was the creed of the orator, such addresses were the means of introducing fatal errors into the Church, which at the first were, like the leprosy, only a white spot, but soon spread to the destruction of its purity, and the ruin of its whole spiritual health.' p. 378.

A work of Ephraem Syrus, a writer of the fourth century, is thus described —

Exhortations to Repentance.—The number *seventy-six*.—The Directions and Counsels contained in these Addresses, could proceed only from one who was well acquainted with the mazes of the human heart, and who was qualified to give the best advice, as having himself proved the efficacy of the plan he marks out for others; there is no vagueness of general address, for the reader feels the words are spoken to *him*, and applicable to *his* state; he does not lose himself in the crowd, but pleads before the bar of his own conscience, and roused by the words of Ephraem, his heart proves true to itself. For the support of the disconsolate, God's boundless mercy is shewn in Scriptural examples of pardoned guilt, and in Scriptural examples of avoiding impending wrath; the slothful are excited to renewed exertions for only *delayed* mercies; the hesitating are confirmed by instances of assured triumph; and the incautious are warned of the flames of temptation ready again to break out from the embers of their formerly imperfectly extinguished fires. When the soul is to commune with itself, Ephraem is a faithful examiner on the part of God, and few have so completely laid open the sorrows that none but an all-merciful Being can assuage.

pp. 409, 410.

In his account of the '*Life of Moses, or a Treatise concerning a perfect Life*', by Gregory of Nyssa, p. 425, which is an allegorical interpretation of the History of the Jewish Legislator, the Continuator very forcibly animadverts on the 'sickly sentimentalism' of allegorizing ministers, and concludes with a prayer for them, which would perhaps be somewhat amended by being allegorically explained:—'May God of his mercy speedily take such injudicious teachers unto Himself!' The

Author, we should imagine, intends only, that religion should be freed from the mischievous methods of treating it, which some of its ministers delight to practise; and would it not be sufficient to pray for them in another manner,—that a sound mind might be given them?

To the accounts of the writers and the analysis of the works of each, the Authors subjoin notices of the *Editio PRINCEPS*, the most valuable edition, *Editio OPTIMA*, and the English translations. These notices are very useful, and are generally correct; but they might in some instances be amended, and in others enlarged. Two *Homelies* are the only parts of Origen which are described as existing in English; and one, a French version of the eight books against Celsus, is mentioned by Dr. Clarke, p. 171. There is an English translation of the work against Celsus, by James Bellamy, Gent., in 8vo. London. B. Mills, *no date*. In the account of the English Versions of Eusebius and the ecclesiastical Historians, p. 253, there are several errors, which we have not the means at hand of entirely correcting. The first translation, by Meredith Hanmer, could not be published so early as 1517. Hanmer died in 1604, and the Epistle Dedicatory of his translation to Robert, Earl of Leicester, is dated Dec. 15, 1584. The fourth edition of the book was published in 1619. The translation of the four books concerning the Life of Constantine, and the two orations, by Wye Saltonstall, added to the fifth edition of Hanmer's work, 1550, were published long before, and should have been noticed separately. The date of the Second translation is given by Dr. Clarke, 1696. A copy of it is now before us. It was printed at the Cambridge University press, by John Hayes, in 1683. We agree in opinion with Dr. C., that a new Translation of Eusebius's History, would be a valuable present to both the religious and the literary world; but, to render it so useful as it ought to be, it would be necessary to accompany it with such comments as would be but very imperfectly supplied by any existing annotations.

Art. VI.—1. *Military Events of the late French Revolution; or, an Account of the Conduct of the Royal Guard on that Occasion. By a Staff Officer of the Guards. From the French. 8vo. pp. 123. London. 1831.*

2. *Narrative of the French Revolution in 1830; an authentic Detail of the Events which took place on the 26th, 27th, 28th, and 29th of July; with the Occurrences preceding and following those me-*

memorable Days. Accompanied with State Papers and Documents. Small 8vo. pp. 407. Paris. 1830.

WE are anxious, at the very outset of the brief article which we are about to connect with these publications, to disavow any intention of involving our readers and ourselves in discussions relating to the events which, in July last, transferred the crown of France from a despot claiming fealty on the ground of divine right, to a king resting his title on the willing homage of his people, and the true interests of the state. The time is not yet fairly arrived for such an investigation: we are as yet in possession of only the general results; and it may be long before the antecedent and concurrent circumstances are so thoroughly sifted and admitted, as to justify their assumption as matters of history. In the mean time, every man is the hero of his own tale; and, without imputing intentional misrepresentation, there is quite enough in the average of human vanity to make us suspicious of every personal narrative. Whoever has heard the same story told by different agents, must have been startled by the marvellous discrepancies, occurring just at that particular crisis where the agency of the narrator becomes conspicuous. It has not unfrequently happened to us, to hear words and actions which, in our own certainty, belonged to ourselves, claimed in all honesty by others when conversing on the subject; and we are satisfied, that the clearest evidence, where self is concerned, is liable to large deduction, even in the entire absence of all misgiving as to motive and intention. It would be too much to expect, that we should suspend this wholesome scepticism in the present instance, where, to say nothing of national characteristics, all the energies of mind and body were on full stretch for the attainment of one object; rendering impossible that calm exercise of the understanding and the senses, which alone can qualify the observer for correct discrimination of circumstances, and for the comprehensive collection of facts.

In military transactions, the matter is considerably different. Every man has his set task and his appointed post; every movement is predefined, and has a distinct and specified object; each separate manœuvre has reference to a combination which regards the whole. Yet even here, amid the perfection of system, and the most anxious vigilance for the unbroken maintenance of order, we find confusion perpetually intruding. On the prescribed arrangement for simultaneous movement, accident and awkwardness are continually breaking in; and amid the uproar of battle, and the shiftings of actual conflict, how few are there who can sufficiently detach their attention from personal circumstances, to observe surrounding objects, and note the casualties of the strife! But if we turn from this scene

of array and combination, to fix our attention on the confusion of popular tumult, where every man acts for himself,—and even conceded command is little more than nominal,—on the strange distractions and incalculable intersections of the warfare of streets, and lanes, and alleys,—on the fiery impulses which call forth and sustain the spirit of insurrection,—on the doubts and apprehensions which visit the undisciplined brave, certain of themselves, but dubious of their companions,—on the social sympathies and anxieties of home;—whoever, we say, will make fair allowance for the working of all these discordant elements, must acknowledge the hopelessness of obtaining clear and satisfactory statements, without a most patient comparison and induction, without an extensive examination of individual testimony, an impartial collation of varying details, and a large allowance for the infirmities of narrative.

The publications before us exemplify, in a very striking manner, the two kinds of statement—the military and the municipal. The ‘Narrative’ is a clever and spirited, though rather wordy digest of the various details supplied by individuals personally engaged, by lookers-on, and by that non-descript class of persons, the collectors of intelligence for the newspapers. It accordingly exhibits many of the faults, both of deficiency and excess, which might be expected in such a compilation; and, while defective in precision, it is redundant in description and decoration. The Writer is evidently, heart and soul, with the people, and we cordially sympathize with his patriotic feelings; but we cannot forget that all such impulses are fatal to that calm, deliberate, and unprejudiced collation and comparison of conflicting statements, without which there can be but small chance of arriving at correct knowledge. He exhibits no anxiety to discard convictions which are so congenial to his partialities: the triumph of the people is his delightful theme, and he spurns at that balancing of probabilities which would certainly check his enthusiasm, and might possibly abate from the brilliancy of his picture. Still, it is a valuable document among the materials for history, though very far from possessing legitimate claims to be considered as an historical record. On the other hand, the detail of ‘Military Events’ has all the requisites in which the ‘Narrative’ is deficient, while it wants, of course, that ardent espousal of the popular cause, which gives interest to the latter. It is written with much ability, and with such professional distinctness and accuracy, as to enable even the unmilitary reader easily to comprehend, by reference to a common map of Paris, every movement and position connected with the memorable conflict of the three days. The Author is free in censure; sometimes, we think, beyond reasonable limit; but, in general, with sufficient justification from the

miserable mismanagement of the royal cause. He is evidently no bigot in politics, though, as evidently, little under the influence of any popular impulse. He clearly holds the people in slight estimation, and ascribes very little of the result to their efforts, of which he speaks in a very Coriolanus-like way. Still, his work is highly valuable, and comes, we doubt not, much nearer to the truth, than the glowing statements of the 'Narrative'. He spares neither the court nor the camp, but points out, with the frankness of a soldier, and the unhesitating precision of a man of knowledge and talent, the faults, both military and moral, which lost the day. He describes, with bitter scorn, the shameless facility with which the courtiers transferred their supple homage from a falling to the rising dynasty; and the following passage, referring to the state of feeling after the evacuation of the Hotel de Ville, will shew the impartiality with which he criticises error wherever he finds it.

'On the return of the troops to the Tuileries, it was reported, and every one naturally believed, that the King and the Dauphin had arrived in the course of the evening; but when morning came, and the absence of the white flag from the top of the Tuileries announced that the King was not there,—that he had not quitted St. Cloud,—perhaps not even Rambouillet (where it was known that he was on the 26th), the soldiers could not repress some feelings of anxiety and disgust, which they expressed in their own energetic language. The *instinct* of the soldier does not reason, but it is always sure. Even the officers could not conceive why the King and the Dauphin had so totally abandoned the fate of the capital to M. de Polignac; for no one in the Guards or the army partook of the extraordinary delusion in which that minister and his very few partizans at court, were plunged.

'The Duke of Raguse himself, though not altogether so unpopular with the Guards, did not enjoy their confidence. Some, the most favourable to him, recollected the constant ill-luck which had marked all his undertakings; others could not approve his political life. This latter opinion was that of the majority of the non-commissioned officers, and of many of the men: with the former, it was a military tradition; with the latter, it was a tale of their infancy;—in the cottages of their fathers they had heard (and, right or wrong, long will be heard) the name of *Raguse* connected with the Prussians and Cossacks. Finally, those who had known the Marshal with the army, at court, or in society, allowed him a considerable share both of talent and knowledge; but they also considered him as a man of theories, which he was never able to apply practically or usefully, either to the business of the state or his own private affairs, or to military operations in the field,—where he was really renowned only for his failures.'

The 'Narrative' sets out by describing the armed force which menaced Paris, as amounting to twenty thousand men, the 'flower of the chivalry of France,' with a 'numerous train of artillery.' It is very evident, that the Writer here takes credit

for the troops of the line, who were invariably neutral, and, if to be counted at all, should rather be set down on the popular side, since, while they gave it but little positive aid, they gave all the encouragement of their evident partiality. The 'Staff Officer,' who gives names and figures, and employs regular addition and subtraction, quotes the number of the Royal Guard actually effective and disposable on the morning of the 28th of July, at 4200 men, infantry, cavalry, and artillery. Of the latter, only eight pieces were employed in the 'Three Days;' and of the forty-five rounds of cartridge furnished to each gun, four only were grape. Concerning the first event of decisive character which distinguished the series of conflicts, the evacuation of the Hotel-de-Ville by the royal troops, the 'Narrative' talks in magniloquent phrase; describes it as taken and retaken three several times, and as ultimately carried by the people.

'The successive capturing and recapturing of the Hotel-de-Ville, awakened the sanguinary recollections of Hougoumont. But while every moment added to the confidence of the people, consternation began to be more and more visible even in the firmest battalions of France. It was in vain that discipline closed her serried files, or opened her chevaux-de-frise of bayonets, only to give scope and efficiency to discharges of grape still more murderous. The Place de la Grève, the Pont de la Grève, and the Pont Neuf, with the Quays, were enveloped in one lurid cloud of sulphurous smoke, pierced by the flashes of the cannon, or the fusillade of the musket. The continuous tirailage of the citizens filled up the pauses that intervened between the platoon-firing of the troops, and the sullen roar of the artillery. The Seine might now be said without a metaphor to "flow purple to the sea." The dead bodies of horses and of soldiers were visible in its stream, carried down in a tumultuous mass to St. Cloud, shortly to announce to the royal tenants of its chateau, the discomfiture of their proudest hopes, by the dismal evidence of this floating wreck.'

This is not in the best possible taste; nor is it a mode of narration which tends to inspire confidence. The insinuation that the Guards were disheartened, is loftily repelled by the 'Officer;' but, in truth, if they had yielded to discouragement, it would have been nothing to their disgrace, since no arrangements whatever were made for supplying them even with the slightest refreshment, and they fought fainting with fatigue and inanition. They fought, too, reluctantly, and only in obedience to their military oath; they saw the troops of the line by their side, looking on them with menacing aspect, and they beheld in their front, their countrymen and kin. Yet, they fought bravely, if not ferociously, and the fault of their failure lay elsewhere. But the Guardsman denies the whole story of the thrice-stormed Guildhall, and his cool statement is in flat contradiction of the 'Narrative.'

‘As to the energy displayed by the people, it is undeniable: every account from individual officers, and every official report, concur in establishing the fact. But *truth* must, on the other hand, be also told: for instance, the kind of attack and defence which was most effective in the hands of the Parisians, was that which was attended with the least danger;—I mean—*war from the windows*. All the barricades, about which we have heard too much, were cleared by the troops. The open attacks made by the people in mass, *could* only be mere failures,—an idle waste of life. At the Hotel de Ville, where they made simultaneous efforts on every side, and where fresh assailants were ready to relieve those that were either wounded or wearied, they made no impression; for it is now indisputable, that this edifice was not, during the whole of the 28th, retaken by the people; and after it was evacuated at midnight by the Guards, it remained unoccupied and deserted till the morning of the 29th. It must be admitted, however, that in the efforts which were made to retake it, we recognize the military instinct and courage of the bravest nation in the world.’

In the grand struggle between the regulars and the people, the two leading events, in which the latter have been represented as triumphing by main force, were the attack of the Hotel-de-Ville, and the assault of the Louvre. We have seen how the ‘Staff Officer’ disposes of the first, and, concerning the latter, he wholly denies to the people the merit of dislodging the garrison. He affirms that the battalion of Swiss which was posted to defend the front of the Louvre, was withdrawn by the blunder of its commander, and that the assailants consequently effected their entrance without the slightest opposition. He attributes the failure of the Royalist force to various causes. 1st. To the strange improvidence which had neglected all efficient preparation, and, instead of having the whole body of the Guards and household troops, amounting to few less than 20,000 men, in readiness, suffered itself to be so completely taken *à l’improviste*, as to have only one-third of that number at hand, and to engage that slender force in desperate conflict, without food, during the greater part of three days. 2nd. To the unaccountable measures of Marshal Marmont, who seems to have manœuvred with a very unnecessary display of military science, and a very decided disregard of common sense. We have taken the trouble of comparing the idle parading of his moveable columns, with the admirable conduct of Bonaparte on the 13th Vendemiaire, in the rising of the armed sections against the Convention. He began by narrowing his line of defence as much as possible, occupying the strongest positions only, and awaiting the attack. When this had been repelled at all points, and not till then, he advanced with troops elated by the superiority they had proved of discipline over numbers, on the barricades of the Parisians, and, by steadily pressing forward, ultimately overcame all opposition. It is interesting to trace on the

map, the simple, yet beautiful manœuvres by which he effected his purpose. Every column, as it was pushed forward, found a *point d'appui*, and a supporting force upon its flanks, until the whole formed, even amid the labyrinth of streets and passages, a consistent and sustained front. Instead of this skilful order, the battalions of the Duke of Ragusa were moving without a definite object, manœuvring to no end but that of fatiguing the men, and fighting under circumstances which would have made it impossible to improve success, had success been attainable.

But the great cause of failure lay in the disaffection of the troops of the line. They evidently, from the commencement, sympathised with the popular feeling; and there was no possibility of mistaking the import of this *sign of the times*. Had the Parisians been defeated, the Pretorian Bands would have been compelled to defend their conquest against the Legions of the empire, and civil war would have raged. But in the war of the *Maison du Roi* against the whole population of France, there were no chances of success to calculate.

We have always felt a persuasion that Charles the Tenth was anxious to avail himself of some opportunity, fair or foul, of teaching his people 'a great moral lesson',—of coming to blows, in the full conviction that the easy victory on which he reckoned, would do more for the establishment of his power, than the subtlest and most successful course of intrigue. It was the firm belief of the Court, that the success of the former Revolution was owing to nothing so much as to the pusillanimity of Louis the Sixteenth; and it was eagerly desired, that opportunity might occur to prove the inevitable failure of insurrection when opposed by the strong hand. The success of Napoleon in 1795, supplied an additional motive, as completing the contrast between the disastrous effects of timidity, and the victorious results of energy and skill. The experiment was tried; and its signal failure offers to the autocrats of Europe a lesson which, impressive as it is, it appears, from issues still pending, that they refuse to learn.

Art. VII. *History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland, from the Restoration to the Revolution.* By the Rev. Robert Wodrow. With an original Memoir of the Author, Extracts from his Correspondence, a preliminary Dissertation, and Notes, by the Rev. Dr. Burn, of Paisley. 4 Vols. 8vo. Price 2l. 8s. Glasgow, 1830.

SOON after the Restoration, a treatise was published, which had been written in the time of the Long Parliament, at the special desire of Charles the First, to prove 'Episcopacy, as established by law in England, not prejudicial to regal power.' The Author, Bishop Sanderson, aptly designated 'that staid

'and well-weighed man', rests his argument on the admission of the supreme authority of the Crown in all matters ecclesiastical; avowing at the same time, that the Church of Rome encroached upon the royal prerogative, in the doctrines of the Pope's supremacy and the exemption of churchmen. These positions are, indeed, incontrovertible, when an appeal is fairly made to the records of history. For, while the state of affairs since the Revolution attests, in a satisfactory manner, that prelatical claims and jurisdiction may be exercised without detriment to regal power, the history of the periods previous to the Reformation, furnishes ample evidence to shew, that the dignity of the Crown and the interests of the commonalty sustained great damage during the usurpations of the Papacy. But, that the supreme ecclesiastical authority transferred from the Pope, and lodged in the Sovereign by the laws of England, (which is, in a double sense, the safeguard of Episcopacy as the established form of Church polity,) has been prejudicial to the civil rights and religious privileges of the nation at large, may be abundantly shewn from the history of the Reformation, and may be especially seen in the policy pursued by the unfortunate House of Stuart. Hence, Protestants in these lands, not being episcopalians, have uniformly protested against the civil headship in the Church, not only as dishonouring to Christ, but as the source of manifold practical evils to the community.

It is as connected with this subject, that we would strongly recommend to the notice of our readers this republication of Wodrow's *History of the Sufferings of the Church of Scotland*. We know of no work which so fully exhibits the dangers resulting from the exercise of the supremacy when a subservient clergy are prepared to gratify the monarch by the extension of the prerogative. Happily, indeed, the same treachery and oppression could not be practised now. Nor is there a disposition in any party to take such undue advantage. The constitution is defined; the plenitude of the royal power is under salutary restrictions; all sects have a safeguard against the exercise of the supremacy, in the progress of knowledge and toleration. Nevertheless, it is important that this right of the Crown respecting all affairs and persons ecclesiastical, should appear in its true and native pretensions, free from those disguises and changes which a multitude of circumstances have forced upon those of the Episcopal communion.

There may likewise be a profitable use of this History, as it furnishes evidence of the concord existing between the Presbyterian Church of Scotland and the early Nonconformists of England, who took common ground in disclaiming civil headship in Ecclesiastical matters, and also in separating from the Episcopal hierarchy; a procedure in respect to which they had

the sympathy as well as the example of foreign Protestants. Nay, at present, and in consequence of the vague and local causes which produce nonconformity on the one hand, and conformity on the other, it is even necessary to revert to the original principles which constrained our pious ancestors to decline the communion of the Establishment. Ignorance of these proper scriptural grounds of separation, or dissent on less valid grounds, has done much to disunite and secularize the Protestant Nonconformists of England; so that it is high time to return to the broad constitutional principles on which the business of Reformation may be renewed. Certain it is, at all events, that there are many claims and concessions which the influential Nonconformist divines would willingly have made, in order to promote the more general and permanent diffusion of saving knowledge, which are not likely to originate from the liberality of their present descendants. Yet, this spirit of the olden sages, who were more anxious for uniformity, than willing to divide the nation into religious sects, is essential to the success of any general movement for the better propagation and maintenance of our common faith.

The most general reason for dissent that can be assigned, we consider to be, that, contrary to Scripture warrant, and in dishonour of Christ's proper authority, the Episcopal Church of England acknowledges, as confirmed by law, the prerogative of the Crown to exercise supreme control over all persons and affairs ecclesiastical. The power thus claimed, had, indeed, been often challenged previously to the Reformation. Certain Sovereigns ventured to consider it to be as much their natural and inherent right, to appoint Bishops to the several sees within their dominions, as to create temporal Barons; and even fancied that it was in their power to confer upon them spiritual functions and jurisdiction. This, however, was always treated by the Court of Rome as an unscriptural assumption; and as such, it was uniformly resisted. But Henry VIII. succeeded in getting a transfer to himself of all the power usurped by the Pope. In a Convocation, and by consent of Parliament, his title was sanctioned, as the Protector and Supreme Head of the Church and Clergy of England; and the claim of Supremacy thus ratified, continues to appertain to the Crown. As explained by divines, it ought, perhaps, to be admitted, that ecclesiastical obedience to the King's laws is limited, with a due regard to the law of God, and that ecclesiastical authority in the discharge of the pastoral office, is acknowledged to be derived from Christ. It is, nevertheless, certain, that the Supremacy was enacted in positive and comprehensive terms, and that, to the exercise of the prerogative, no limits were practically set.

In order to prove that, according to our English laws, the

King is really the only fountain of all ecclesiastical authority and jurisdiction*, and that the clergy, of whatever rank or degree, possess not any other power than that which they derive from him, it is only requisite to quote the enactment passed in the 37th year of the reign of Henry VIII. It is thereby declared, 'that Archbishops, Bishops, Archdeacons, and other ecclesiastical persons, have no manner of jurisdiction ecclesiastical, but by and under the King's Majesty, the only undoubted Supreme Head of the Church of England, to whom, by Holy Scripture, power and authority is given to hear and determine all manner of causes whatsoever, and to correct all manner of sin and vice whatsoever.' This power of our Kings was confirmed in the reigns of Edward, James, Elizabeth, and Charles; except that, owing to some scruples on the part of the Queen, the title of Supreme Head was changed, in the time of Elizabeth, into that of Supreme Governor. Then, as to the spirit in which the prerogative of Supremacy was interpreted and put into execution, there can be no controversy, when the acts which flowed from this source are considered. Henry immediately vested the delegation of his whole ecclesiastical power in his viceroy Cromwell, who held precedence next to the royal family. He also proceeded by summary process to abolish monasteries, and to appropriate their revenues for the benefit of his treasury. Subsequently, he caused to be passed a law enacting the Six Articles, against the wish of the reforming party, to which he compelled submission under pain of death. No sooner had Edward succeeded, than the new Bishops took out a commission, by which they declared that they held office only during the King's pleasure, and were to exercise their functions as his delegates. When Elizabeth had taken order for the uniformity of religion, according to the Protestant changes, she not only deposed the Bishops who refused to take the oath of Supremacy, but persecuted many pious men who were sound in the faith, because they could not yield compliance to all her ecclesiastical injunctions. A commission was granted, for a general visitation of the whole kingdom, empowering certain noblemen and others in each province, only one of whom was a clergyman, to examine the true state of all the churches: to suspend or depose such of the clergy as were unworthy, and to proceed against such as were obstinate, by imprisonment, church censures, or any other legal way.

As might be expected, the Supremacy had an effect prejudicial to the progress of the Reformation. It gratified the

* See on this subject, our Review of Allen on the Royal Prerogative, at p. 455 of our last volume.

pride of Henry, who rejected or confirmed according to his sovereign pleasure the points of faith and of ritual in dispute between the Reformed and Romish Clergy. The King, says Burnet, seemed to think that his subjects owed an entire resignation of their reason and consciences to him: and as he was highly offended by those who still adhered to the papal authority, so, he could not bear the haste that some were making to a further reformation before or beyond his allowance. He was all the while fluctuating; sometimes making steps to reformation, but then turning back to his old notions. Notwithstanding it is true, that the Supremacy was exercised beneficially during his reign, in procuring the translation of the Scriptures in the vernacular tongue, the disuse of various superstitious practices in worship, and the separation of the English Church from the Communion of Rome. It is true also, that the Articles set forth under Edward to promote concord and quietness in religion, the publication of which is not so advantageous to the true Protestant faith, had their original authority by virtue of the King's Supremacy. Yet, this very prerogative was made a handle of by those friendly to the old state of things, as they protested against all changes in religion till the Sovereign should be of age, and on the accession of Mary, had a plausible pretext for overturning whatever was contrary to her will. And had not Elizabeth, along with the exercise of great authority in ecclesiastical affairs, retained a strong predilection for many of the tenets and usages of the Romish Church, there can be no doubt that much greater advances would have been made towards a reformation during her reign, than actually took place.

It would, however, be unfair to bring forward these statements (although they consist merely of historical facts,) as connected with the Supremacy, without acknowledging at the same time, that the Reformers lamented the necessity under which they were constrained to act. Having formally consented to the absolute authority of the Crown, they could not consistently refuse to comply with any regal injunction in ecclesiastical affairs; and having to do with Sovereigns so obstinate and untractable as Henry and his daughter Elizabeth, who were also fond of pomp and full of superstitious partialities, it was extremely difficult for them to serve the cause of the Reformation, even when they were ready to take the hazard of encountering the royal displeasure. For example, to instance only in the case of the Liturgy. The greatest caution was necessary in producing the Book of Common Prayer, which remains in a state very different from that in which the true and hearty Protestant prelates were inclined to leave it. When first set forth by authority under Edward VI., it was deemed advisable to conform the prayers and ceremonies as much as possible to the ancient model;

thereby, if possible, to draw in some of the bishops, and reconcile the prepossessions of the people. In consequence, 'they so ordered the matter, as that they might seem to have translated the ancient forms into their mother tongue, rather than to have wholly laid them aside. After being used awhile as it was first published, the book was removed; when some additions were made to it, and such particulars changed, as had been retained only for a time. There is also reason to believe, that Cranmer had himself drawn up a much more perfect Liturgy than that furnished by the Second Edition of the Common Prayer, in the hope of finding an opportunity to get it sanctioned by authority. Indeed, we are informed in the preface to the original production, that they had gone as far as they could in reforming the Church, considering the time they lived in, and hoped that those that came after them would, as they could, do more. It is, therefore, gratifying to learn, that when Bullinger and some other learned foreign divines objected to the Bishops, that they had allowed some matters enjoined by the Common Prayer Book, they replied in their letters, that they had no choice in reference to the settling of such things. They declared that none of them were of the Parliament-house at the passing of the Book, and that therefore they had no voice in making the law; that, after it was passed, they being chosen to be bishops, must either content themselves to take their places as things were, or else leave them to Papists and Lutherans. But, in the mean space, they promised not to urge their brethren in these things, and when opportunity should serve, to seek reformation of them.' Unhappily, however, as regarded the consistency of their conduct and the uniformity of religious worship, they did not redeem this promise, but took measures which gave great trouble to conscientious ministers, and actually became more severe, the longer they were in office: so that, in consequence of the offence created by the rites of the Common Prayer Book, the act which enforced the use of the canonical habits, and the general laxity of discipline, thousands were constrained to leave the communion of the Church, and thus embrace all the hazards of persecution for conscience' sake.

It was, then, against this unscriptural assumption of supremacy on the part of the Crown, and subversion, in its tendency and effects, of the true interests of the Church of Christ, that the Puritans and Nonconformists, together with the Presbyterians of Scotland, have been united ever since the time of Elizabeth. But, in the exercise of holy zeal in opposition to this claim, those who were called to suffer under a Protestant government, only adhered to the sentiments of the Fathers of the Reformation. This, indeed, is the broad foundation on which those who

are faithful to the sole prerogative of Christ, as the only head of his Church, should agree to erect their standard of union and hostility. The present is a time which no longer admits of temporizing measures, when ancient principles should be revived, and the spirit of former days be awaked. Looking to the character and consequences of the supremacy as so long exhibited in these lands, well combined efforts to withstand it would have been of incalculably greater advantage to the cause of undefiled religion, than all the party zeal which has been spent on the matters which divide the millions of the anti-prelatical Protestants of the British empire.

Art. VIII. *The Sacred Offering*, a Poetical Annual. MDCCCXXXI. 32mo. pp. 191. Price 4s. 6d. in silk. Liverpool.

WE have been much pleased with this unpretending, but extremely neat and tasteful little volume, composed entirely of original poetry of a devotional character, or religious tendency, by anonymous contributors; varying, of course, in merit and interest, but averaging far above mediocrity, and bearing the unequivocal impress of genuine poetic feeling, and a highly cultivated mind. The following specimens will, we imagine, amply justify our encomium, and excite an interest in the volume.

‘ TO A DESERTED HOME.

‘ When morning blushes o’er these scarce-green fields,
On their scant trees pouring its glory down,
No burst of joy the brightening landscape yields,
It marks the blighted verdure near a town.
And when the purple evening fades away,
No wave reflective shews its parting beam,
But the last lingering hues of farewell day
Here all unnoticed shed their softened beam.

‘ I had a home—ah me! a home no more,—
Most calmly fair in its green loveliness,
Shadowed with trees, and bound with sea-girt shore,
With view all rich in its unboundedness;
Far distant hills, most faintly, sweetly blue,
Skirting the horizon with their peaks of snow,
And valleys, meadows, bright as eye ere knew,
Spreading their mingling beauty wide below.

‘ O prospect glorious! thou art in mine eye
As when I stood with never-sated gaze,
On our own terrace, watching to descry
The little sail-boat ’midst thy pathless ways.

Yes, here thou livest ; memory has enshrined
Thy quiet walks, thy boundless solitude,
And each loved scene that I have left behind,
Comes glowing on my heart with life imbued.

‘ Alas ! there only—days and years may pass,
And I thy lonely walks no more shall tread,
These feet shall press no more thy well-known grass,
Or raise thy humble violets from their bed.
No ; all the freshness, sweetness of thy flowers
May wildly bloom, for no accustomed hand
Shall kindly twine them round their moss-grown bowers,
And taste must wave no more her magic wand.

‘ Though all unseen, still may thy dark woods wave,
Thy flowers still glow in summer’s radiant breath ;
May beauty shroud thee, silent as the grave,
And be around thee in thy transient death.
And when again to sound of human voice
Thy far-hills echo, then may peaceful hours
And rural pleasures bid their hearts rejoice,
With purest happiness, as once did ours.’

‘ THE FIRE-SIDE.

‘ How many feet upon this fender placed,
In other years, duly as evening came,
Have crowded our fire-side, the feet of those
Our childhood fondly loved : but scattered now,
Perchance ’midst all the toils of life to feel
The fond regret, the deep and natural grief
That flows upon the thought of broken ties,
And sweet dreams buried in the far dark past.
And some have left us for the brightening glow
Of their own happy hearth, for days and hours
Lighted with love’s own sunshine ; yet sometimes
With changeless heart, as in the long, long days
Now gone for ever, and with constant feet,
That know the accustomed place, they turn to thee.
Aye, and some feet have prest thee once that ne’er
Shall touch thy bars again ; some feet that now
Have run their weary race, and are stretched out
In the calm silent grave. O how we loved them !
Nor summer hour, when nature from her lap
Pours forth her beauty ; nor in winter nights,
When circling to thy blazing side we cling,
As the wild tempest rages, and the moon
Puts forth her pale, cold cheek to meet the blast,
And the dark night-cloud rises ; never, never
Shall we forget those who have left their place,

Their wonted place amidst our little band.
 We speak not ; but the tear is in our eyes,
 The throb is in our hearts, and as we crowd
 More closely round thee in our loneliness,
 Fond memories will arise and take us back
 Amidst the scene of long-forgotten things.
 Aye, and we hear again the merry laugh,
 And the light-hearted peal of opening youth ;
 Again we sit beside the forms we love,
 And time and distance, vast, unmeasured days,
 And wide estranging scenes, and death itself,
 All vanish at our bidding ; and we turn
 To answer smile with smile, and greet again
 Our best and dearest, ours, a moment ours.
 We rend oblivion's veil, we burst the band,
 And on our ears the tones we loved are breathing
 As they were wont to breathe. Is it a dream ?
 A single cinder falls upon thy hearth,
 And we start back to melancholy truth.
 Oh and is life so brief ? And are its ties,
 Its holiest ties so frail and vanishing ?
 Pass but a few short years, and shall *we* too
 Be missing in our places ? Gracious Heaven !
 With noble purpose and eternal hope
 Encompass thou our spirits, guide us on
 From race to race, from light to purer light,
 To the high source of being ; till our hearts
 Thirsting for holiness and glory, rise
 On wings of faith above this fading scene
 Of mortal suffering, and expand in love
 Which seeks communion with the realms of God.'

ART. IX. LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

In the press, *On the Personality and Divinity of the Holy Spirit.*
 By J. Pye Smith, D.D. &c.

Col. Bouchette will publish during the present Month, a *Topographical and Statistical Description of the British Dominions in North America*, including *Observations on Land-granting and Emigration*, &c. in 4to., with Views, Plans, &c.

In the press, a Third Edition of a *Manual of Surgery*, founded on the Lectures lately delivered by Sir A. Cooper, Bart., and J. H. Green, Esq., F.R.S., containing several additional Notes from the Works of other distinguished Surgeons. Edited by Thomas Castle, F.L.S., of Queen's College, Oxford, &c.

Also, an *Introduction to Medical Botany*, illustrative of the Science as connected with Medicine. An improved Edition. By Thomas Castle, F.L.S., of Queen's College, Oxford, &c.

Mr. Booth, the Author of the "Analytical Dictionary," has in the press, a Work on the Principles of English Composition.

In the press, Dedicated by permission to the King, and to be illustrated with beautiful Engravings, Travels in the Holy Land. By William Rae Wilson, Esq. F.S.A. With some interesting Letters from Foreign Sovereigns to the Author, on the Protestant Faith.

Nearly ready, in 1 Vol. 8vo., Examples in Algebra. By the Rev. W. Foster, M.A., late Scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge, Head Master of St. Paul's School, Southsea, Portsmouth.

Mrs. Lachlan has a Work nearly ready, Dedicated by Permission, to Her Majesty, entitled *Agapæ*, or, the Sacred Love-Plledge, in 1 Vol.

In a few days will be published, A Help to Professing Christians in judging their Spiritual State and Growth in Grace. By the Rev. John Barr, Author of "The Scripture Student's Assistant," &c.

In the press, 15th Edition, corrected and greatly improved, of an Introduction to Mensuration and Practical Geometry, with Notes containing the reason of every rule. By John Bonnycastle, Professor of Mathematics in the Royal Military Academy, Woolwich.

Mr. William Howitt has in the press, a series of Traditions of the most ancient times, containing The Pilgrimage of Partika; Nichar; The Exile of Heaven; Istran the Demoniac; The Avenger of Blood, and Tidal King of Nations.

In the press, A Philosophical Estimate of the Controversy respecting the Divine Humanity. By John Abraham Heraud, Esq. Author of "The Descent into Hell," a Poem.

In the press, A Panorama of Constantinople and its Environs, from Sketches taken on the Spot. By J. Pitman, Esq. The Panorama will be accompanied with a description of the Principal Buildings, and an Account of the Manners and Customs of the Turks, Greeks, Armenians, &c. The whole to be folded in a neat case of portable dimensions.

In the press, Leigh's Guide for Travellers through Wales and Monmouthshire, with a minute Description of the Wye. Illustrated with a correct Map, &c.

Mr. Roberts of Llwynrhudol, is preparing for publication, The Welsh Interpreter, containing a concise Vocabulary and Useful Phrases, on the plan of Blagdon's French Interpreter, to be comprised in a portable volume.

Mr. Conder's "Italy", in three volumes, may be expected to appear early in the month of March, the greater part having already passed through the press.

ART. X. WORKS RECENTLY PUBLISHED.

BIOGRAPHY.

A Memoir of the Life, Writings, and Correspondence of James Currie, M.D., F.R.S., of Liverpool, Fellow of the Royal College of Physicians, Edinburgh, of the London Medical Society, &c. Edited by his Son, William Wallace Currie. 2 vols. 8vo. 1*l*. 8*s*.

The Annual Biography and Obituary for the year 1831, containing Memoirs of Celebrated Persons who have died in 1829-30. 8vo. 15*s*.

EDUCATION.

An Abridgment of Zumpt's Latin Grammar, for the use of Schools. By the Rev. J. Kenrick. M.A. 3*s*. bound.

HISTORY.

Memoirs of the Affairs of Greece; containing an Account of the Military and Political Events which occurred in 1823, and following years, with various Anecdotes of Lord Byron, and an Account of his last Illness and Death. By Dr. Julius Millingen, Surgeon to the Byron Brigade at Missolonghi, and to the Greek Army in Western Greece, Peloponnesus, &c. 8vo. 10*s*. 6*d*.

MISCELLANEOUS.

The Arguments advanced against the Enfranchisement of the Jews considered, in a Series of Letters. By Francis Henry Goldsmid.

Festivals, Games, and Amusements, Ancient and Modern. By Horace Smith, Esq., Author of "Bramletye House," &c., forming the fifth number of the National Library. Small 8vo. Neatly bound, with Plates. 6*s*.

Speech of Mr. William Collins at the first Public Meeting of the Edinburgh As-

sociation for the Suppression of Intemperance, June 8th, 1830. 8vo. 6*d*.

THEOLOGY.

The true Nature of Christ's Person and Atonement stated, in reply to the unscriptural Views of the Rev. Edward Irving "On the Human Nature of Christ." By William Urwick. 12mo. 5*s*.

Christian Patriotism; or the Duty of Christians towards their Country at the present Crisis: a Sermon delivered in the Congregational Chapel, Colchester. By Henry March. 12mo. 6*d*.

A Country Rector's Address to his Parishioners, at the close of the twenty-fifth year of his Residence among them, with Reference to the disturbed State of the Times. 8vo. Second edition. 6*d*.

A Letter to his Parishioners on the Disturbances which have lately occurred. By a Country Pastor. 12mo. 2*d*. or 1*s*. 9*d*. per dozen.

A Sermon on the Duty of Civil Obedience, preached at Kettering. By Thomas Toller. 8vo. 1*s*.

A Letter to a Conscientious Advocate for Strict Communion. By William Grover. 3*d*.

The Divine Authority and Perpetual Obligation of the Lord's Day, asserted in seven Sermons delivered in the Parish Church of St. Mary, Islington. By Daniel Wilson, M.A., Vicar. 12mo. 2*s*. 6*d*.

Hints illustrative of the Duty of Dissent. By a Congregational Nonconformist. 18mo. 1*s*.

TRAVELS.

Journal of a Nobleman; comprising a Narrative of his Travels, and of his Residence at Vienna during the Congress, with numerous Anecdotes of Distinguished Characters. 2 vols. Post 8vo.